A Compendious DISCOURSE UPON THE CASE,

As it ſtands between the Church of *England* and of *Rome* on the one hand, and again between the ſame Church of *England* and thoſe Congregations which have divided from it on the other hand.

TOGETHER WITH

The Treatiſe of the Diviſion of the *Engliſh Church* and the *Romiſh*, upon the *REFORMATION*.

Enlarged with ſome Explicatory Additionalls. By *H. F.* D.D.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. G.* for *R. Royſton*, at the Anſtel in Ivy-lane. 1655.

BODL. LIBR.
31. JAN. 1916
OXFORD

BODL. LIBR.
31. JAN. 1916
OXFORD

To the Reader.

BE pleased to understand, that for amending not a few faults escaped in the first Edition of the Treatise touching The Division of the English and Romish Church, upon the Reformation, *the Printer intended a second. In order to which,*

the Corrections were ſent up to him with ſome explicatory Additionalls; *but other more neceſſary imploymēnts intervening eauſed him to lay it aſide: and when I thought he had forgotten it, and was willing he ſhould doe ſo, he lets me know he had reprinted ſome ſheets of it. I did not like he ſhould after almoſt two years ſuppreſſion, ſend it abroad with no more advantage: it came therefore*

fore into my minde to draw up the Case into a more compendious and methodicall Discourse, and to adde the other part of the Case, as it stands betweene us and those that have divided from us; still making references to the like points and passages as they lye scattered in the Two Treatises before printed: This of the Division, *&c. and that other of* Certain considerations

touching this Church.

What is here done, is intended, and accordingly contrived (with such brevity and plainnesse, as the Cause would well permit) for satisfaction of those, who, not acquainted with large Controversies, are ready to receive the instruction given them; and being still in the Unity and Communion of this Church: are willing to continue therein, notwithstanding the

the Temptations on both sides; or else following the seduction of the one side or the other (Romish *or* Sectarian) in the simplicity of their hearts, *are not unwilling to return upon discovery of the Error, and danger of their Way. Which that they may see, I pray God in time to open their Eyes.*

Errata.

ERRATA.

PAge 15. l. 28. adde *former*. p. 24. l. 11. after *serving God* adde *Rom.* 12. 1. p. 28. l. 15. for *or Western*, r. *and Western*, l. 25. after *of which time*, adde l. c. *of the four first generall Councels*. p. 31. l. 20. for *Christ always*, r. *and always*. p. 45. l. 27. after *yet*, adde *they think*. p. 49. l. 13. for *All* r. *Article*, p. 54. l. 6. for *of* r. *or*, p. 87. ult. for *preserving* r. *preventing*. p. 111. 16. for *understanding* r. *undervaluing*, p. 122. l. 25. for *know* r. *knew*, p. 126. l. 11. for *that may* r. *that they may*, p. 129. l. 25. for *his* r. *their*. p. 136. l. 15. for *the old Prophet* r. *old Prophets*, p. 144. for *cares* r. *jarres*.

A Compendious Diſcourſe upon the caſe, as it ſtands between the Church of England *and of* Rome *on the one ſide; And again, between the ſame Church of* England, *and thoſe, who have divided from it, on the other.*

§. I. The Church of England.

I Need not premiſe any thing for diſtinguiſhing the three Parties concerned in this caſe. They are too much at odds, and their differences too many and notorious; yet leſt there be a miſtake in Names, (becauſe all the Sects in this Nation call themſelves *Churches*, and *Churches* of *England*) therefore by the *Church of England* is underſtood the Church of Chriſt in this

Land eſtabliſhed upon the Reformation, holding out her Doctrine and Government in the 39. Articles, her Liturgy and Publick Divine Service in the Book of Common-Prayer: and all thoſe are called Sectaries, and are proved ſo to be, who (of what perſwaſion ſoever) have departed from, or refuſed to hold communion with this Church upon diſlike of Doctrine, Government, Liturgy, Rites and Ceremonies, or any of theſe.

It holds the truth between Romaniſts and ſectaries.

The Church of *England*, ſtanding thus between the Church of *Rome* on the one hand, and the aforeſaid Sects, which have divided from it on the other hand, is challenged, and aſſaulted by both, put now to defend it ſelf againſt both. Which brings to mind the Device of ſome *Romaniſt*, who to make himſelf merry, has pictured an *Engliſh Proteſtant* ſtanding between a *Papiſt* and an *Independent*, borrowing Arguments and Reaſons from the One, to oppoſe or anſwer the Other: Againſt the Papiſts he muſt plead (as do all Sectaries) Inviſibility of the Church, Scripture

pture alone, Liberty of private judgment: against other Sects he must help himself by urging (as do the Papists) the visible condition of the Church, the Authority of it, Catholick Tradition and Practice, and the Succession of Bishops and Pastors. Well, the *Romanists* may thus seemingly please themselves, but indeed This of all other Reformed Churches has been, and is, by reason of its most regular Reformation, their great eye-sore and heart-sorrow. And the *English Protestant*, or obedient Son of the Church of *England*, as he is well set between a *Papist* and *Sectarie*, as between two Extremes, so he onely is able to stand against the opposition or pretensions of both; for if we examine the false Grounds and deceiving Principles of Both, as to this point of the Constitution, Government, and Communion of the Church: we shall clearly see the Truth lyes in the midst between both, and the Church of *ENGLAND* holds and maintains it. To give some Instances.

§. 19. First instance in Holy and Catholick.

I. The Church of Christ according to the Article of our Beliefe is *One, Holy, Catholick.* The *Romanists* run away with the name *Catholick*, appropriating it to themselves, and every Sect with the title *Holy*, holding themselves the only Congregations of Saints. And as the *Romanists* enforce the name *Catholick* to the prejudice of the Title *Holy*, admitting no Church to be Catholick, that will not defile it self with their errors and corruptions: So Sectaries, under pretence of advancing *Holinesse*, and purity, and of gathering a *Holy* Church, and assembly of known Saints, overthrow the *Catholick*, and draw the Church of Christ into a corner, confining it to their own Sect or perswasion. Now see the Church of *England* in the midst: which by a most regular and warrantable Reformation had respect to both, and in relation to the title *Holy*, provided for *purity of Doctrine* and worship so, that there can be no just complaint of Errors retained, and for *purity of life*, by coercion of Ecclesiasticall censure so, that no scandalous

or

or notorious offender ſhould be ſuffered. So in relation to the title *Catholick*, this Church did retain (as for Belief, ſo for practice) whatever had that ſtamp of Conſent of all Ages upon it; not confining the Church of Chriſt within the bounds of her perſwaſion, but leaving it ſtil Catholick, and communicable to all ſuch Chriſtian Aſſemblies, as doe not wilfully cut themſelves off, but are careful, ſo far as they have means, to hold the *Unity of faith*, with the *bond of charity*: which is neceſſary for preſerving that *one body*, which is the Church, *Eph.*4.4. 13.16.

II. As for *Catholick or Univerſal Practice or Tradition*, which ſtands in the conſent of all the Churches in all Nations and Ages ſince the Apoſtles, as *Sectaries* wave it altogether, as wholly contrary to their Novelty, ſo *Papiſts* pretend it onely, reducing it into the teſtimony of their preſent Church, and cannot truly give Catholick Tradition for any point of their faith and worſhip, wherein they differ from us. But the Church of *England*, in the midſt between both, In Catholick, Practice and Tradition.

denying onely the *Romish* Tradition, which brings not down any part of their Faith or Worship through all Ages from the Apostles, admits of the true Catholick Tradition or Practice, and yields due Authority to it: the force of it resting upon common sense and reason (which is in every man, and which he must forsake that denies the Witnes of such Tradition) it being not possible, that all the Christian Churches, which began in and about the Apostolical Times, and so succeeded through all Nations and Ages, should be either deceived in what they unanimously witnessed, or agree all of them to deceive those that followed them. Whereas the testimony of the *Romish Church*, being but part of the *Catholick*, and possibly over-ruled with some prevailing *Faction*, cannot convince upon any such *common notion* of humane reason; but must first prove it selfe to be the onely Church, and infallible. And seeing it is forced to seek such proofe by witnesse of Scripture, they plainly run in a Circle from the testimony of their Church to the receiving or proving

proving of Scripture to be the Word of God, and back again from the Witneſſe of Scripture to prove their Church; But *Catholick or Univerſal Tradition* brings down Scripture to the Conviction of Heathens or Jews, that will but uſe their common ſenſe and reaſon: that diſcovery, which Scripture makes of it ſelfe by light from the innate qualities, and internal Arguments relucent in it, comes after, and appeares to them onely, that having entertained it upon the former Witnes of Catholike Tradition, are verſed in it. So by this Witnes of Catholick Practice in obſerving the *Lords day*, *Eaſter day*, *Epiſcopal Government* throughout the Church from the Apoſtles time, we are aſſured that ſuch paſſages of Scripture, as concern any of theſe, doe ſhew the Beginnings of the ſaid Practices: and the *Church of England*, as it received at firſt and ever ſince obſerved the fore-mentioned particulars, ſo it commands in generall, due reſpect and adhæſion to that ſenſe of Scripture, which comes down by ſuch univerſall conſent.

In the visible and invisible condition of the Church

III. Whereas the condition of the Church according to severall respects admits the distinction of *Visible* and *Invisible*, the *Romanists* beare themselves too much upon the one extreme, and the Sectaries upon the Other: the first will have such a *visible* flourishing condition of it, as is inconsistent with that state, which the Church of Christ has and may fall into, and prejudiciall (as by them pretended) to all just Reformation, and profession of Truth, which more neerly concerns the life and soul of the Church, and the more *invisible* perfection of the members thereof. And therfore they please themselves with the outward garb and face of their Church, and will have it tryed by the conspicuous Eminency of it, (as *Tr.* 1 *c.* 12.) rather than by truth and purity of doctrine. Sectaries on the other extreme bear themselves too much upon the *Invisible* condition of the Church, which stands in those inward qualifications of true faith and sanctification, requisite to make a true and lively member of Christs mystical Body: so that

that in the purſuit thereof, and in pretence of gathering Churches conſiſting of ſuch members onely, they *diſſipate* the viſible Church of Chriſt, and diſſolve the Government he has ſetled in it.

But every true *Engliſh* Proteſtant acknowledges the Church of Chriſt is a viſible ſociety of Believers, or of Profeſſors of the Chriſtian Faith, (of whom ſome are effectually called, true and lively members, but that is *inviſible*, others not yet advanced beyond the externall calling or profeſſion) a ſociety, I ſay, of ſuch Profeſſors, under ſuch a Regiment or Government left by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: and left to this purpoſe, to keep all in unity, and to advance thoſe, that are admitted in the *viſible* Church to the meanes of Salvation, unto a reall and effectuall participation of Grace and Union with Chriſt, as lively Members of his body, *Eph.* c. 4. 11 12, 13. 16. And therefore all Chriſtians are bound to yeeld obedience to the lawfull Paſtors and Governors of that *Viſible* Church whereof they are Members.

The Article touching the Church.

All this we professe in that Article of our Creed touching the Church; for albeit that *invisible* condition of true Faith and Sanctity be the highest concernment and qualification of a Member of Christs Church, and the attaining to that condition be the hope and aime of every good Christian in the Visible Church, and therefore the chiefest thing in the profession of that Article, (*viz.* a Communion of such true Believers, Saints, and Members of Christ) yet because the administrations of the *visible* Church tend necessarily unto that end, and he that cuts himself off from the communion of the *visible* Church, bereaves himself necessarily of the means to be advanced to that *invisible* condition; therefore he that professeth this Article, sayes he believes Christ alwayes has his *visible* Church, which may be found, in which such Meanes and Administrations may be had, and that he yields obedience to the Pastors and Governors set in it to that end and purpose.

IV. As the Romanists pretend to an

an infallible assistance of Gods Spirit bound to St. *Peters* Chair; so have Sectaries their confidence of the speciall guidance of the same Spirit. And if we set the vanity of the one against the other, we may find as much semblance of Reason from those places of Scripture, which Sectaries alledge for every true Believer so inspired and directed, as from those places the Romanists alledge for the Papal Infallibility, of which *Tr.*1.*c.*27. Both these pretences are the very bane of the Unity of the Church: *Romish Infallibility* rendring that Church incorrigible, and setting it beyond all bounds of accord with other Christians, that desiring Reformation, will not be satisfied or put off with that pretended priviledge: and the pretence of *Sectaries*, rendring Pastors and Teachers in the Church useless, or at least weakning the obedience due to them, puts it into the power of every one, that will fancy himselfe a true Believer, and guided by such assistance, to be a Reformer, and to break the Church in pieces.

In the Papal Infallibility and private judgment.

In

In the Church of *England* no ſuch pretence, either of Infallibility in the Governours, or of Private Judgment in any againſt their Governours; but ſuch Authority of Governours and Paſtors lawfully conſtituted, as is beyond Appeal, (ſave to a Generall Council ſitting) and competent to determine and define in all Cauſes, and to ſtop the mouth of the gainſayer, and bind under Eccleſiaſticall Cenſures. The ancient Church pretended to no more, had no other way, or means of preſerving Unity; as ſaid *Treat.* 1. c. 13.

When we ask of Thoſe, that diſſent from this Church, in following their own ſenſe or interpretation of Scripture, *Who ſhall judge?* The Papiſts think we then come into their Road, and oppoſe their Plea to our Sectaries; But we are ſtill in the midſt between them: Not eſtabliſhing a Papal Infallible Judge, nor allowing Private Judgment to ſtand againſt the Publick: Not calling them to be tryed at *Rome*, as if that Church ſhould judge for all, but to ſubmit to the Publick Judgment of this National

tional Church, of which they were Members, and in which there is such power (as is said) of judging for others, and of censuring or binding the obstinate Gainsayers, as *Treat.* 2. *c.* 1. *nu.* 36.

If it be objected, There was such Authority in the Governours of this Church before Reformation, how then could Private Judgement take place against them, to introduce the Reformation?

We answer, It is possible there may be cause of dissenting from the chiefe Governours of the Church, and that Reformation may take its first rise from Private Judgement, as *Tr.* 1. *c.* 9. but then to be managed with all peaceable moderation and subjection, as is there shewn, and more largely, *Tr.* 2. *c.* 1. Now whether our Reformation took rise from some private judgement intimated to them in Authority, or from the immediate inclination and judgment of those that had the Authority, it is not materiall, seeing all was carryed peaceably, and the work done not against, but by those that were the

the chiefe Governours in the Church.

In the due subordination of Pastors and Governors.

V. As for that due Subordination of Pastors and Governours in the Church, seen and set forth in the true ancient Episcopal Government, it is wronged on both sides. The first invasion was made upon it by Papal usurpation, under the title of *Universal Bishop or Pastor*, which in the judgement of *Gregory* the first, is to make him in effect the onely Bishop, and all others but his Ministers, as the same *Gregory* declared against *John* of *Constantinople*, affecting that Title, and cleared himselfe and his Predecessors from assuming it to themselves. But it was not long ere his Successors challenged and obtained it, and ever since have used it to the vassalage of Christian Bishops, where they will suffer themselves to be so abused. On the other side, every *Sect* risen in these dayes, has lift up a hand to pull down that office and power, making spoil of the Means and Maintenance thereunto belonging. The Church of *England* in her Reformation did according to the

the Universall Practice of the Church, retain the Episcopal Government, vindicating it from Papal Usurpation; and is now put to defend it against the invasion of all other Sects, which therefore stand convinced of down-right Schisme; as will appear below. I have the longer stayed upon these Instances, because they doe much tend to the clearing of the businesse in hand. Now more particularly to the Case, which is thus in generall resolved.

§. III. Resolution of the case.

The true Protestant Church of ENGLAND *is unjustly charged with Schisme by the* ROMAN, *for that Division which followed between them upon the Reformation: But does justly charge all other Sects with Schisme, which have divided from it, since that Reformation.*

National Church.

There are three words to speak of here by way of Explication, 1. *National Church*; for we have often spoken in the Treatises, and still shall speak of the Church of *England* as of

of a Nationall Church. That therefore is to be accounted a Nationall Church, which has in it the whole subordination of Church governments, (as the third Councel of *Carth. Can.*2. *Provincia quæ primas sedes habent*) *viz.* One Primate, with severall Bishops, Priests and Deacons: Whether the extent of it be bounded with the Limits of the Nation, or according to the Precincts appointed by the Ancient Councils, or the Supreme Civil Power. Every Congregation, nay every House may bear the name of a Church, (*the Church in their house, Rom.*16.5.) but as part onely of, and in subordination to the National Church. So the Churches of *Ephesus, Rome, Corinth*, upon the first planting of Christianity in these Cities, began in a singular Congregation, but being inlarged to a due fulnesse, had every of them the exercise (or practise) of that whole subordination of power and Government.

Reformation Publick or Private.

II. For the word *Reformation*. We must distinguish between that which is *Publick* or *Nationall*, the reformation

tion of a whole Church, in forbidding and casting out errors or Corruptions in beliefe or practice, and that which is *Private or particular*, the Reformation of a mans self, in not admitting or ceasing to professe Errors prevailing or imposed by the Church, of which he is a Member, or in which he was baptized and Educated: upon which Reforming of himselfe may follow a dividing from that Church *by Excommunication*, or at least by *Non-communion*.

III. Touching the words *Schisme*, or dividing of Communion, we must distinguish *Actual non-communion*, or want of Actual Communion with a Church, from *Schisme* or the guilt of *Schisme*. The first, which is want of Actual communion may happen between two Nationall Churches disagreeing in some practises, and that disagreement followed with too much heat, (as *Tr.* 1. c. 17, 18.) and sometimes between a Church and particular Members of it, through mis-informations, passion, exasperations: But *Schisme* is a wilfull (*i.e.* voluntary, causles,) dividing or separating

Actual Non-communion.

Schisme.

parating from those we ought to hold Communion with. And as before said of *Non*-communion, so observe that the guilt of *Schisme* may fall either upon a Nationall Church causlesly dividing from, or refusing to hold communion with other Churches: or else upon the Members and parts of a National Church, withdrawing their obedience from their lawfull Pastors or Governours, and dividing from them and the Congregations under them: setting up a distinct communion, or joyning themselves to any such, elsewhere set up, The case between the *Churches* of *England*, and of *Rome* stands according to the first consideration of *Schisme*, as it falls between two Nationall Churches; and if the division, which followed upon the Reformation, must be call'd *Schism* we shall see in examining the cause of our Reformation, that the guilt of it falls on them, not us; But the case between the Church of *England* and other Sects, which have divided from it, stands according to the second consideration of *Schism*, between a Nationall

Difference of it in regard of the parties between which.

tionall Church and the Members thereof. Which dividing from it ſtand guilty of the higheſt degree of diſobedience unto their Governours, and the higheſt breach of Charity both towards their Governours and alſo all the people of God continuing in obedience to, and Communion with them.

Laſtly, there are degrees in the height and guilt of *Schiſm*. A *Schiſm*, by a bare receſs from the Communion of an eſtabliſhed Church, ſetting up a diſtinct Communion from it, but leaving it in its own condition and eſtabliſhment, pretending only to private or ſelfe-reformation; Such was the *Schiſm* of former *Separatiſts*, whileſt this Church ſtood free from violence, They went their way, and it remained where it was. This incurrs the guilt aforeſaid of high diſobedience and breach of Charity: but not in ſo high a degree as that which followes. A *Schiſm*, that not only divides from the Communion, but alſo offers violence to the deſtruction of the Church, pulls down what was, not only perſons and Governours, Difference in degrees of it.

vernours, to set themselves in their places, but also the form and government it selfe, to set up their own in stead of it. This is higher and farther than ever any of the Ancient *Schismatikes* went, which changed not the form of Government alwayes used in the Church: and this will be considerable in the violence of our modern *Schism*. But before we charge them according to the premises, let us clear the Case as it stands between the Church of *England*, and that of *Rome*, charging us with *Schisme* upon the Reformation.

§. IV. Our Defence against the Church of Rome.

Our Defence in generall comes to this (as it was touched *Tr.*1.c.4 5,6.) This Church had *Cause* for such Reformation, and Authority for the doing it: sufficient both. For when such Errors prevail in a Church, and come to such generall practice, it is high time by due Reformation to cast them out: and when they are in Authority be convinced and doe it, then is the Reformation just and lawfull.

Just cause for Reformation.

First, there was *sufficient Cause* by reason of Error and corruption in belief and Worship, such as we could not

not continue in without groſs diſſem-
bling and wrong to our conſciences
and Gods honour. The truth and e-
vidence of this ſtands upon the exa-
mination of thoſe doctrines touching
Faith and Worſhip, wherewith the
Engliſh Church was generally tain-
ted according to the *Romiſh* infecti-
on. The tryall whereof was in part
made, *Tr.*1.*c.*30. to ſhew that the
points, wherein they and we differ,
cannot be (as they would impoſe up-
on the world) *Catholick doctrines*,
i. e. the beliefe and practice of the
Church in all ages ſince the Apoſtles,
or as S. *Jude*, *ver.*3. calls it, *the faith
once delivered.*

But farther, to the end that they,
which cannot examine all the *Romiſh*
doctrines, whether they be Catholick,
or profeſſed in all Ages, may briefly
and more neer at hand ſee ſo far into
that Church, as to perceive it is not
ſuch a Church, that they, who have
means to know better, can ſafely or
conſcionably communicate with: We
will make a brief tryall or eſtimate
of a Church, by the *Faith*, *Worſhip*,
Sacraments profeſſed, practiced,
ad-

Trial of a Church as to a ſafe communi-on with it.

administred therein; for these the Romanists will not deny to belong immediately to the constitution of the Church: and therefore fit to give us direction for holding, or not holding Communion.

As for example, If we finde any Church or Congregation of Men, calling themselves Christians, deny directly and peremptorily any Article of the Creed or Belief, into which all Christians are baptized, as professed *Arrians* and *Socinians* doe; it is evident their Error is immediately against the foundation: they doe not deserve the name of Christian Churches. We doe not so charge the Church of *Rome*. But albeit she holds the Foundation, yet finde we her superstructures, in no less matters than of Faith and Worship, to be such as the Foundation will not safely bear, nor any good Christian (coming to the knowledge of them) conscionably endure. For when any Church propounds any thing, as matter of Faith & Worship without manifesting the truth thereof to mens consciences by clear consequence from those

thoſe prime Fundamentals into which they are baptized, or from Scripture it ſelfe: it is intolerable. For this Rule is juſt and reaſonable; Whatever the Church propounds ſo to be believed and practiced, it ſtands bound ſo to manifeſt the ſame: elſe it ſets it ſelfe in Gods ſtead, taking an immediate dominion over mens faith and conſciences; but in all other things, which the Church propounds and enjoynes, as matters of Order, Ceremony, diſcipline, for the more ſignificant profeſſion of that Faith, or the more decent performance of that Worſhip, every Member of the Church is to obey, or to bring as expreſſe warrant from Gods word againſt the particular he refuſes to doe, as the command is expreſſe, which binds him to obey thoſe *that are over him in the Lord.* Were this Rule well held to, there would have been more peace in the Church. It was neceſſary for *peaceable* ſubjection, *Tr.2.c.1.* will be uſeful below againſt thoſe that cauſeleſly divide from this Church. And as to the preſent Caſe, we did not quarrell at

A neceſſary Rule.

at the Church of *Rome* for matters of Rite, Order or the like, but of Faith and Worship. The *superadded Articles* being so farre from a manifestation by clear consequence as above said, that they proved clearly inconsistent with the Word: and the worship then in *an unknown tongue* against the Apostle plainly, 1. *Cor.* 14. against the reason of a *reasonable serving of God:* beside that Worship which was given to *Images* against the expres words of the second commandment.

Lastly, examine a Church by the Sacraments in it administred: Those two, which confessedly are of Christs appointment. Where we finde the Cup denyed to the Cummunicants, we see a direct breach of Institution, a defrauding the People of God of that part of the Sacrament which affords and makes them partakers of Christs blood-shed, also where we finde a daily propitiatory Sacrifice established, we plainly see a depravation of the Sacrament, and a derogation to the *One oblation* upon the Cross. Thus to say nothing of Primitive

mitive Antiquity: it is cleer to every one that ſees any thing, there is juſt Cauſe of Reformation, where ſuch Errors and Corruptions have prevailed, and of ceaſing to communicate (at leaſt as to thoſe Errors and Practiſes) with that Church which will not (being admoniſhed) reform them: ſo that if the Queſtion be put to any man, whether he will be of the *Engliſh* Church, as it was corrupted together with the *Romiſh*, or as it was after reformed? it amounts to this: Whether he would be a ſick and diſeaſed man, or whole and healthfull? Whether keep company with perſons infected, or with thoſe that are cleare and ſound? The choice is eaſie to a man in his wits.

§. V. Juſt and ſufficient Authority for publick Reformation.

But to caſt thoſe Errors and Corruptions out of a Church, by publick Reformation, is required *Sufficient Authority*. That alſo was not here wanting, both the *Civill* and the *Eccleſiaſticall*. Both theſe were ſeen in the Ancient lawful Synods, gathered and held for the ſame purpoſe of Reformation. And there-

fore every Nationall Church, having within it self, the whole subordination of Ecclesiasticall Power or Government, (the Permission and Authority of the Supreme Civill Power concurring) may reform it self, *i. e.* make a publick nationall Reformation. The Antient Council of *Arles* in *France*, the severall Councils of *Carthage* in *Africa*, of *Toledo* in *Spaine*, did so; and that not onely in matters of *Discipline*, but *Doctrine* also; as that of *Arles*, for rebaptizing them which came from Hereticks, denying the Trinity. *can* 8. The *Melivetan* Council determined against the *Pelagean* Heresie: The third Council of *Toledo* gathered for extinguishing the Reliques of that Heresie, which had long infected the *Gothick* Nation, and hindered the meeting and benefit of such Councils: as King *Riccared* (who called that nationall Synod) complaines in his speech to the Bishops then assembled.

Againe, these Councils were gathered, and held, and did conclude independently on *Rome*, or without ac-

acknowledgement of any ſuch Juriſdiction, as was after challenged by the Biſhop of *Rome*. Faire reſpect indeed was had to that Biſhop in a *fraternall* way of Communion, and ſometimes of communicating to him, what they had done and concluded; as that firſt Council of *Arles*, *Fratri Syiveſtro*, and *charitativè ſignificamus*; In the third Council of *Carthage*, *Can.* 47. for reading nothing in the Church but Canonicall Scripture, it is added, *Hoc innoteſcat fratri & con-ſacerdoti Boniface* (I ſuppoſe they mean *Boniface*, Biſhop of *Rome*) *vel aliis earum partium Epiſcopis*, to the end, this Canon might be received and practiſed in thoſe parts: But preſently after in the fourth Council (in which S. *Auguſtine* was) when the Liberty of their Church ſeemed to be infringed, through a kinde of Juriſdiction challenged by the ſame *Boniface* in the point of Appeals, they utterly rejected his Plea, which he made by the generall Council of *Nice*, but could not prove it. So he that looks into the ſeverall Councils of *Toledo*, will

finde no signification of a dependance on *Rome*, but great acknowledgement of the religious care of their severall *Kings*, by whose permission they assembled.

Such authority in the nationall Ch: of Engl.

The Church of *England* therefore being such a Nationall Church, and having like power, might lawfully reform it self without asking the Bishop of *Rome* any leave, or without staying for a free generall Councill: for albeit such a Councill was in agitation, yet could not be expected, either a *generall* one, because of the Division of the *East* or *Westerne* Churches, or a *free* one, because of the Popes exorbitant power, as *Tr.* 1. *cap.* 4. And as it might, so it did justly reforme, casting off in the first place that Papall usurpation, which hindered all Reformation, but defining nothing against the definitions of known and approved Generall Councils, (within the compasse of which time Cardinall *Perronn* thinks it reasonable the triall of a Church be restreined, as *Tr.* 1. *c. ult*) unlesse some will quarrel at something of *Discipline*, not retained in our Church,

church according to the ancient constitutions: which being a matter of prudentiall Provision, admits variation according to the Exigence of the Times. Also it is cleare, that Nationall Synods have not held themselves alwayes bound to all things determined formerly in that kinde, but have put the receptions of such Canons to the vote, as we see in the beginning of the first of *Toledo*; *Statuta Concilii Niceni*, The Statutes of the Council of *Nice* about Ordinations, before not used among them, are voted there to be observed. Also we finde they frequently make relaxation of former rigour, as in the injunctions of *penance*. Lastly, it is evident, there are many constitutions of this kinde not reteined or observed by the Church of *Rome*; Such as concern the exercise of publique Penance; such as forbid the translating of a Bishop from City to City, and Ordinations without a Title: things determined in generall Councils. Of this, as to the point of single life of Clergy men, *T. 2 c. 1.* & of the whole point of the war-

rantableneſs of our Reformation, *Tr.* 2. *c.* 2.

§. VI. Upon theſe Grounds, it is eaſie to anſwer, what they object or pretend againſt us, which, that it may have the better impreſſion upon the unwary, they repreſent the Church of *England*, before Reformation, wholly Romiſh, profeſſing their Doctrine ever ſince the receiving of the Faith in this Land, under *Gregory* the firſt, Biſhop of *Rome*, acknowledging that juriſdiction, and accordingly yeilding Obedience to that *See*, yea, and owing it as Duty upon the converſion of this Land. From theſe premiſes their Inference is (and they think it will take with the unwary) That the Church of *England* by her Reformation, has caſt off the Faith received, and ſo fallen into *Hereſie*, and by denying ſubjection to that *See*, has incurred the guilt of *Schiſme*. But as there is ſome truth apparent in the Premiſes, ſo as much Falſhood ſuppoſed, and taken for granted, which renders the Inferences inconſequent and invalid.

Anſwer to the Romiſh Plea.

Firſt, it is a Truth, that the Nationall

nall Church of *England*, before the Reformation, was generally *Romiſh*, both for Doctrine profeſſed in it, and for Obedience yielded to the Biſhop of *Rome*; but then the Inference they make, therefore the Proteſtant Church of *England* is a New Church, or Heretical, is invalid, becauſe it reſts upon this untruth, ſuppoſed, and taken by them for granted, *viz.* that the *Romiſh* Church was alwaies ſuch, teaching ſuch Doctrine, and that the profeſſion of ſuch Doctrine makes a Church to be *Catholique*, and the denyall of it renders it *Heretical*; all which they muſt prove to make good that Inference; where as it is evident that the Catholique Chriſtian Faith *once delivered*, *Jude* 3. Chriſt alwaies profeſſed in all ages (and into which they and we baptiſe) makes a *Chriſtian Church*, and the holding that Faith *undefiled*, and free from Errours and Corruptions in Belief and Worſhip, makes a pure and *Orthodox Church*. So did the ancient Church of *Rome* hold the Faith, ſo does the reformed Church of *England* hold and profeſſe it,

What makes a Church Chriſtian Orthodox.

freed from the mixture of Errour, which had crept into the later Romiſh Church, to the infecting of the Engliſh; ſo that this National Church is ſo farre from being *Hereticall*, by ceaſing to be *Romiſh*, that it is therefore the more pure and *Orthodox*.

Upon the like ſuppoſals, falſe and impertinent, they give pretence (plauſible to the unwary) for that demand: *Shew ſuch a Proteſtant Church in England before the Reformation*, as if every Nationall Church did alwaies teach the ſame Doctrine, without mixture of ſuch Errour generally prevailing; or as if it were reaſonably required of us to ſhew the Church of *England* alwaies *Proteſtant*, *i.e.* proteſting againſt Errors, whereas the Errours were not alwaies, nor at firſt known; or to ſhew a *Reformed* Church before the Reformation made. For though Truth be alwaies before Errour, yet Errour is before Reformation, which proteſts againſt it, and caſts it out. So the *Engliſh* Church, as corrupted with *Romiſh* Errours, muſt needs be

Proteſtant and reformed.

ſo

ſo before it could be *Proteſtant* or *Reformed*; but the Catholick Truths it alwaies held made it a Chriſtian Church, even under that mixture of Errours: ſo when by Reformation it had caſt them off, it remained the ſame Chriſtian Church: but a more pure and ſound one, holding ſtill the ſame Catholick Truths, without that mixture of Errour, like as the ancient Chriſtian Church did, before Popery prevailed, as *Tr.* 1. *c.* 1.

we have not caſt off the Faith received.

Secondly, It is a Truth, that the *Saxons* or *Engliſh* (whatever preparation they had to it by the Vicinity and Acquaintance of the *Britiſh* Chriſtians) did indeed receive the Chriſtian Faith from *Rome*, through the godly care of *Gregory* the firſt, then Biſhop, and the Miniſtry of *Auſtin* and others, whom he ſent to preach it here. But then the untruth (which they ſuppoſe, and uſually impoſe upon the unwary) is palpable, *viz.* That the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, as to Faith and Worſhip, is the ſame it was in *Gregorie*'s time: and that we, by Reformation have caſt off the Faith we

received. For firſt, as to the maine and fundamentall Faith, that makes a man or Church Chriſtian, no queſtion but *Auſtin*, and thoſe that were ſent, preached that they baptized into, which is the very ſame that we do ſtill. Then as for the matters of Faith and Worſhip, which they and we differ in, the Novelty is clear: neither can they demonſtrate, that any point we caſt off, was a doctrine of Faith in S. *Gregory's* time. Some things, I confeſſe, of misbelief and practiſe, were then crept in, and gathering ſtrength; but it is obſervable, that in all their allegations of Fathers for the points we differ in, their owne *Gregory* comes rarely in; indeed, that Purgatory was his *opinion*, they have expreſſe proof, not that it was an article of Faith in that Church. On the contrary, it is plaine, that *Communion in both kindes*, was the doctrine and practiſe of the Church in his time, as it had been alwaies before: that *Image-worſhip* is declared againſt in his anſwer to the Biſhop of *Marſellis*: the Title alſo and Juriſdiction of

Univerſall

Universall Bishop (which immediately concernes the Cause in hand) is declared against, in his contestation with *John* of *Constantinople*, who affected it. In a word, had the Church of *Rome* continued the same for Faith and Worship, as it was in *Gregory*'s time, and the Bishop of *Rome* taken no more to himself than the said *Gregory* did, certainly it would not have come to a division, neither would there have been cause for it.

§. VII. Deniall of Obedience to Papall jurisdiction makes not Schismaticall.

Thirdly, it is a Truth, that the *English* Church (still generally taken) before Reformation, acknowledged the Jurisdiction of that *See*, but the Inference they make (therefore it is Schismaticall in casting off or denying to yeild obedience thereunto) is invalid; for it supposes this untruth, that we owed it of duty upon special re'ation, *viz.* our conversion or receiving the Faith by the Ministers of that *See*. To answer,

I. It seemes the Bishop of *Rome* makes his claim to *England* upon a double Title, One of *Universall Pastorship*, which extends to all Churches

Bishop of Rome his pretence to universall jurisdiction.

Churches of what Plantation soever; the Other of Conversion or Plantation, which reaches to *England*, and some other Nations; and it seemes, when these Titles are divided, the first prevailes, and swallowes up the other, and so brings under his Jurisdiction, all the Churches which other Apostles (besides *Peter*) and their Successors planted. Whereupon it followes, that the other Apostles shall not leave the like Title of Jurisdiction to those which succeeded them in the Churches they planted, unlesse dependantly on *Rome*: also that the other Apostles laboured dependently on *Peter*, and as his Ministers and Commissioners plaated Churches for him to rule over as supreme generall Pastor; when as it is evident they were sent immediately by Christ with equall commission to plant Churches in all the world: *Go teach all Nations*, Mat. 28. and *As my Father sent me, so I send you*, John 20. Therefore *Peter* and *Paul*, when they made that agreement, *Gal.* 2. departed to the work upon equall termes.

To

To eſtabliſh this firſt and tranſcendent Title of Univerſal Juriſdiction, they are bound to make good theſe ſeveral untruths. That it was ſo with *Peter* in reſpect of the other Apoſtles: That it is ſo with the Succeſſors of *Peter* in reſpect of Thoſe which ſucceeded the other Apoſtles in the Churches by them planted: That the Power and Priviledge pretended to be in *Peter*, was derived upon his Succeſſors: Laſtly, that it is derived onely upon the Biſhops of *Rome*, not of *Antioch* or elſewhere. All theſe they are bound to make good; yea, and ſeeing all their *Romiſh* faith (reſting upon the pretended Priviledges of that *Church*) is founded upon theſe falſe Suppoſals: they are bound to make all good by apparent Scripture; for they grant, that the prime points of Faith, neceſſary for all to believe (as this is according to their doctrine) are clearly conteined in Scripture. But to ſhew this point of the Priviledges of that Church (*Infallibility* and *Univerſall Juriſdiction*) ſo conteined, is impoſſible for them to do; for

Impoſſible to make it good.

for when in this vast Controversie they leave nothing untoucht in Scripture or Fathers, which may be drawn to make any seeming appearance for such priviledges, they doe but give us *words*, nothing of force to prove the *thing* indeed. Some passages to this purpose in *Tr.*1.*c.*27. and in *cap.*28.*&* 30.

His special pretence to jurisdiction over this Chur:

II. As to his second Title from Plantation of the Church here: We doe not find, that the Converting of any Nation to the Faith gave a Title of Jurisdiction to that Church from whence that Nation received the Faith; for we doe not see it was held for any Rule in the distribution of Provinces, and the limiting or extending the bounds of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction: We doe not find that the ancient Councils, which provided therein, had any respect to such Title, but to the constitution of the Empire rather, and the Provinces thereof; and that the alteration, which has been any where since made in the bounds of National Jurisdiction, followed the division of Kingdomes into which the Empire

was

was broken: which appears in the ſeverall Councils of *Toledo* (above mentioned) under their ſeverall Kings, without dependance on *Rome*. And if we look into the *Saxon* Church and Councils (gathered and publiſhed by the induſtry of Sir *Hen: Spelman*) it will appear, that all the Application made unto, or intercourſe had with *Rome*, did not ſpeak a *due ſubjection*, but at moſt a *voluntary adheſion*; not acknowledgment of that *Juriſdiction*, but of their *fair reſpect*, ſuch as any Church ought to have to that Church, from which it received the faith, ſo long as that Church continues ſafely in the faith it propagated, and ſo in a condition of giving adviſe and direction to, and of receiving due reſpect and complyance from thoſe, among whom it planted the faith.

But as Errors prevailed in that Church of *Rome*, ſo in this; and among the reſt, that uſurped Juriſdiction. Pope *Hildebrand* or *Gregory* the 7. about 400. years after *Gregory* the firſt, did lay on that yoak, and began to bring the necks of Kings

and

and Princes under it too: and ſtill by their power does the Biſhop of *Rome* hold his juriſdiction over the Churches within their Dominions, as *Spain*, *France*, &c. But ſuch Princes as came to underſtand their owne right, not onely in Civil, but Eccleſiaſtical things, did juſtly vindicate their Crowns to the power and dignity due unto them, and their Churches to the Liberty and Independency, which, as aboveſaid, belongs to every National Church, having within it the whole Subordination of Eccleſiaſtical Government.

Concluſion of the whole caſe as it ſtands with the Roman Church.

To conclude. Seeing by Reformation we caſt out, as we had juſt cauſe, Error and Corruptions crept in upon the Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip, and retained what ever was Catholick, we cannot be accuſed of *Hereſie*; Seeing alſo by the ſame Reformation we caſt off the yoak of an uſurped Juriſdiction, and vindicated this National Church to the juſt Liberty, we cannot incur the guilt of Schiſme: for that breach of Communion, which followed either upon our ceaſing to hold and practice with them

in

in the aforeſaid corruptions, or upon our denying farther obedience to that uſurped Authority, cannot be imputed to us, who had juſt cauſe for doing it, and uſed juſt Authority in the doing. But if that *breach of communion*, which followed, be *Schiſme*, the guilt of it reſts upon the Church of *Rome* in generall, and on all *Engliſh Romaniſts* in ſpeciall: according to the ſeverall conſideration of Schiſme (above, §. 3.) as it falls between two National Churches, or between any National Church and the Members thereof; When between two National Churches, that Church ſtands guilty, which gives the cauſe, and peremptorily proſecutes it: So the Church of *Rome* did, by impoſing (under pretence of Infallibility, and therefore incorrigible) her own doctrines, pronouncing all thoſe to be Heretiques that did not receive them, and by uſurping Univerſal Juriſdiction, concluding them Schiſmatiques, that did not obey. But the guilt of Schiſme lyes upon all Engliſh *Romaniſts*, holding to that Church, as upon Members dividing themſelves from the

the body and communion of their National Church; and this concerns not onely thoſe, who have revolted from this Church to the *Romiſh*, but ſuch as alwayes profeſſed themſelves to be of that Church: it falls upon theſe not for deſertion or ſeparation, but for *Recuſancie*, or their refuſing the communion of their National Church, and adhering to a forreign Juriſdiction: which is contrary to the way and order which the ancient Church took for preſerving Unity, and excluding Schiſme: by no means ſuffering ſuch diſobedience and diviſion of the Members of any National Church, where that Church did not divide it ſelf from the Catholick, or give cauſe, as the Church of *Rome* has done.

§. VIII. Second caſe as to thoſe that have divided from this Chur:

Now to the conſideration of the Caſe, as it ſtands between the true Reformed Church of *England*, and Thoſe who (of what perſwaſion ſoever) have divided from the communion of it.

By that which has been ſaid, it is evident, the Reformation made by this National Church was moſt juſt and

and regular: taking for the *Rule*, Gods Word, with the consent and practice of the Ancient Church, and thereupon rejecting no more than was necessary, and retaining what wns usefull: shewing therein a due zeal of Truth, together with Christian Prudence and Charity: to the taking away just cause of Complaint from all distempered Zelots, and giving fair occasion of conviction and allurement to those of the *Romish* persuasion, from whom we differ; when they shall duly consider, there was no more Difference made, than needs must: Whereas others, who have endeavoured Reformation out of a misguided zeal, taking for their *Rule*, an opposition to the Church of *Rome*, rather than a conformity to Gods Word, and the Consent of Primitive Times, have cast out for Popery many things (*Episcopal Government*, *Set Forms of Liturgy*, *Kneeling at the Communion*, and the like) which were most undenyably before Popery was hatched in the world. Now these being cast out upon that score by Heady Reformers, who call

Difference 'twixt just and distempered Reformations.

call themſelves Proteſtants, (Proteſtors indeed againſt many Truths) the Papiſt takes them up, and thanks ſuch Reformers for yeelding ſuch Truth to be Popery; and ſo he remains more confirmed in his way, and hath more cauſe of offence at Reformed Proteſtants, were they indeed to be meaſured by ſuch irregular proceedings.

The Romaniſts know this well enough, and are ſenſible of the difference between the Reformation or Eſtabliſhment of the Church of *England*, and all other pretenſions: and therefore have made it alwayes their main deſign, to undermine this Proteſtant Church ſo wel eſtabliſhed: and in theſe dayes, the Emiſſaries of *Rome* have been very active to help forward a confuſion, joyning themſelves (if there be truth in that, which ſo many have reported on their knowledge) to Sects of ſeverall Perſwaſions, for the pulling down what was, and advancing their pretended Reformations. Not that the *Romaniſt* approves them, but becauſe he knows, that if the Church of

England

England, eſtabliſhed on ſuch ſure grounds, can by any means be ſubverted, the other unbottom'd Reformations will fall of themſelves, or ſtand at no ſtay, to the ſhame of the Religion they profeſſe; and ſo make fair way for the *Romiſh* Religion, to come in through their breaches, or over their ruines, and find more generall entertainment. It is the Tempters Policy, and indeed his Maſter-piece, when he muſt act an *Angel of Light*, and muſt make his advantage of thoſe that are come to ſome ſenſe of Religion, or at leaſt to a conceit they are religiouſly diſpoſed, to lead them on by falſe Lights, and make them over-act their parts by a miſ-guided zeal, to a quarrelling with their Governours, and ſlighting all former Reformations, under pretence of Purity and Reformation; til in purſuit of that purity, and ſeeking out a more Reformed Aſſembly or purer Church, they run themſelves clean out of the Church, and yet carry it with them.

Whither they are run, that have left us, let them look to it. It is our work

now

now to shew (and I wish they would sadly consider it) what they have incurred by leaving us, no lesse than the guilt of Schisme, which lies heavily on as many as have (of what perswasion or Sect soever) wilfully divided themselves from the communion of the Church of *England*: Whether they doe this (as above premised) by a bare Separation, or by adding Violence and Sacriledge to it, in pulling down, and (as much as lies in their power) destroying what was established, that they may set up their owne forme and way of Government, and publick Worship. I said *divide themselves wilfully*, to lessen the guilt of those that follow the Schisme *in the simplicity of their hearts*, deceived with the faire pretences of Religion and Purity, which they could not at first see through; but if they will not use their eyes, and carefully look into their way: if they will not use the best meanes they can for discovering the obliquity and danger of that way, and so returne from it, they lye under the same guilt with those they follow,

and

and will *with them fall into the ditch.* Alſo we muſt note here the difference of the *Caſe*, between us and them, from that with the Church of *Rome*; which will at firſt ſight ſhew the impertinencie of the Romaniſts alledging, that the preſent Sects of theſe dayes may plead againſt the Church of *England*, from which they have divided, what the Church of *England* can againſt the *Roman*; for, as it was above premiſed, the caſe betweene *Engliſh* and *Romiſh* Church, is as between two Nationall Churches, having full authority for publick Reformation; but the caſe between the *Engliſh* Church, and thoſe that have divided from it, is between a Nationall Church, and the members of it; by which appears, they could have no ſufficient *Authority* for *publick Reformation*, without, and againſt the *Authority* in being, to pull down and ſet up as they have done, and it will appear they could have no juſt *Cauſe* for ſo much as a *Separation* from the Communion of this Church.

Now

§. IX. Now for making good the charge of Schisme against them, we will premise some undeniable Truths, which speak the Autority of Church-governours, the obedience due thereunto, the condition of Schism, and the danger and guilt of it.

Grounds laid for convincing them of Schism.

1. Church Government.

I. That the Church of Christ is a Society or Company under a Regiment, Discipline, Government, and the Members constituting that Society, are either Persons taught, guided, governed, or Persons teaching, guiding, governing: and this in order to preserve all in Unity, and to advance every Member of this visible Society, to an effectuall and reall participation of Grace, and Union with Christ the Head; and therefore, and upon no lesse account is obedience due unto them: *Eph.*4.11,12, 13,16. and *Heb.*13.17. and he that will *not hear the Church*, be *as a Heathen and Publican*, Mat.16.

2. Church Authority in making Decrees & Orders

II. That every Nationall Church has power, as to determine in matters of Faith, according to Gods word, so to determine in things indifferent, Rites, Ceremonies, matters

ters of order, as in prudence it ſees moſt fit for the better and more convenient performance of Gods worſhip, or adminiſtration of Diſcipline and Government. This is plain by the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 14. 26, 40. The Rule above delivered ſpeaks to this purpoſe, That the Church propounding or determining matters of Faith, or of the ſubſtance of Worſhip, ought to manifeſt it out of Gods Word, cannot doe it *beſides the ſame*, (as the 20 *Act* of our Church hath it) and we may expect ſuch manifeſtation or proof, before we yeild the abſolute aſſent of belief unto any thing ſo propounded; But in the Churches determination of things in themſelves indifferent, and enjoyning the obſervation of Rites and Ceremonies, it is enough that the particular be not againſt Gods Word: and he that will not yeild obedience to it, is bound to ſhew it plainly contrary to the Word, or elſe ſtands guilty of diſobeying the known precepts of the Word, which command obedience to Authority.

It will not be enough to say, The Governours of the Church did not hold to their Rule, for this Rite or Ceremony is not to *edification*, is not *decent*; it might be better otherwise. For this is to set a mans owne judgement, against that of the Church, in matters of prudence: a spice of that pride and self conceit, which is the Mother of all disobedience & Schism; and though a private judgement might truly say, some things might be better done in, and about Gods Worship or Service; yet unlesse such a one can say as truly, those things are unlawfull to be done, and that by direct warrant from Gods Word, he ought not to disobey.

3. Force of Church-Customs.

III. When the Apostle used an argument from *Custome* against certaine disorders, *We have no such Custome, nor the Churches of God*, 1 Cor. 11. 16. he plainly shews what force the *Customes of a Church* (so they be not against Gods Word) have to binde the Members of that Church, as from Introducing any New Custome without Authority,

so

ſo to obſerve ſuch Cuſtomes as the Church hath; and he that will not, is reckoned by the Apoſtle there, among the *Contentious*, or diſturbers of the peace of the Church; for againſt ſuch he urges that. Much more are we to take notice of the ſtrength of Univerſall Tradition, the Cuſtome and Practice of the whole Church in all Ages: for of this we ſhall have occaſion below againſt the *Contentious*.

IV. In the ſame Epiſtle (for it is mainly ſpent upon this Argument) he commends *Charity*, as a Remedy againſt that Pride, which upon conceit of Knowledge, or Spiritual gifts (*cap.*12.) pufft them up, and made them ſwell one againſt another, and deſpiſe one another; the ready way to Diviſion, and breaking all aſunder. This Charity (not that which does workes of mercy, or relieves the poor, as we ſee by *ver.*3.*cap.*13. but which bindes together the body of the Church; *Edifying it ſelfe in Love*, as *Eph.*4.16. (Charity in oppoſition to Schiſm) this I ſay he commends, and by ſeverall proper- 4. Vnion of charity.

ties describes: *It vanteth not, is not puffed up*, ver. 4. not against Equals, much lesse in setting our private judgement against our Governors. *It thinketh no evill*, ver. 5. It receives satisfaction easily from Equals, interprets their Words and Actions to the best: much more the commands and doings of our Governours. *Charity seeks not her owne, endureth all things*, ver. 5, 7. suffers much, rather than come to open difference and contention with Equals: so will peaceable Charity suffer much ere it come to a division from the Church: much lesse will it seek that which is anothers, that especially which belongs to the Governours, their power, meanes, preferments. Thus Schism takes beginning from Pride, and self-conceit, goes on by uncharitableness to enormous excesse of disobedience and injustice; and renders all Knowledge, Faith, and other good workes, for want of this Charity, unprofitable, nothing worth; as the Apostle in that *Chapter* often tells us.

V. The

V. The Apostle when he set *Titus* over the Churches of *Crete*, directs him in the use of his power, as to this point of dealing with the *Contentious*, *Tit.* 3.10,11. *A man that is an Heretick—reject—being self-condemned.* Every Schismatick is this Heretick: for so the word Heresie and Heretick signfies, and according to the use of it then implyed; one, that obstinately stood out against the Church, or that lead any Sect: *after the strictest Sect* (or Heresie) *of the Pharisees*, Act 26.5. *after that—which they call Heresie—Act.* 24.14. a Factious company divided from the Church, so they called or accounted of Christians; and *Gal.* 5.20. we have it reckoned among the workes of the Flesh, *Debates, Contentions, Heresie*: So here *Heretick*, that leads a Faction, a Sect, or that wilfully followes or abets it. A Man therefore that is a *Heretick*, contentious, disobedient to the Order and Authority of the Church, *reject*, for he is *self-condemned*, having both passed the *Sentence* upon himself, by professing against,

5. Admonition and rejection of Hereticks and Schismaticks.

or dividing from the Church, and also done execution (like that of the Churches censure, and excommunication) upon himselfe, by actuall separation, or going out of the Church. A fearfull condition.

Application of the Premises.

Now the application of the Premises to the convincing of those that have divided from the Church of *England*, is very easie and obvious. Disobedient they are to the lawfull Authority in this Church: and that, not onely in their denying to obey the Orders, Decrees, Constitutions Lawfully made by them which had the Authority, but in an utter withdrawing of their obedience for the future: yea, in abolishing and taking away (as much as in them lay) that very Authority and Office too; a step farther than ever the Antient Schismaticks went. And all this against the *Constitution* and *Custome*, not onely of this Church, but of all the Catholick Churche: against that *Charity* which Saint *Paul* enjoynes, as most necessary to preserve the Unity of the Church, and to keep out Schism: against all the *admoni-*

tions.

tions (not once and againe , as the Apoſtle bids *Titus* , but often given them) yea, ſatisfactions endeavoured by the Governours and Writers of this Church, in all the particulars of Government , Worſhip and Ceremony, which the *Contentious* from time to time excepted againſt.

§. X. Anſwer to their plea againſt this Church.

Let us then hear what they plead to this charge, by way of exception againſt the Church of *England*, and briefly rejoyne, ſo as may be to the ſatisfaction of them at leaſt, who deſire to continue in the Unity of the Church of *England*, notwithſtanding the Temptations of the Times, and to the reduction of ſuch as follow the Schiſm *in the ſimplicity of their hearts*, deceived by the faire pretences thereof.

VVant of Purity.

Their generall pretenſion for themſelves , and exception againſt this Church , is, *their deſire or ſeeking of Purity, Holineſſe, ſtrict walking*, which they could not have or exerciſe (in that way they deſired) under the Government, or in the way of Worſhip, uſed in this Church of

England. Answ. The pretence of Purity, Holinesse, and strict life, has a faire glosse, and to endeavour it really and conscionably is the duty, and should indeed be the desire and care of every Christian. But we finde the *Pharisees* in the *Jewish* Church, pretending to it above all other, and by the forced exercises of it, drawing admiration from the beholders, and bringing in Proselites to their Sect; and it would be worth the examining, at least in the Consciences of these Pretenders, whether *their righteousnesse exceeds the righteousnesse of the Scribes and Pharisees!* Our Saviour has also foretold, that false Teachers shall arise in his Church, and come in Sheeps cloathing, but may be known by their fruits. We finde also that the Antient and famous Schisms of the *Novatians*, and *Donatists*, had the pretence of purity and strictnesse; *Novatus* about the year 250. was so strict, that he denyed reconciliation to all that after Baptisme fell into Adultery, or in times of persecution yeilded to Idolatry: and broke with the

Ancient Schismaticks had like pretence of purity.

the Church for re-admitting ſuch upon their unfeigned Repentance. His followers were called *Cathari* or Puritans upon this pretence, and many followers he had; yea, many of the *Confeſſors*, ſuch as ſuffered for the Chriſtian Faith, were carryed away with that falſe pretence, and ſided awhile with him, till ſeeing their errour, they returned again to the Unity of the Church, and condemned his Schiſm, as Saint *Cyprian* relates it to *Cornelius*, Ep. 46. *Donatus* in the next age after him, diſcontented becauſe he could not be made Biſhop of *Carthage*, divided himſelf and his party from the Communion of the Church: deſpiſing it as a mixed company of *good* and *bad*, and rebaptizing all that revolted from the Church to his Communion, confined the true Church onely to thoſe of his perſwaſion: for under that pretence of Purity, he drew many away, and it proved a Schiſm of great extent, and long continuance.

If therefore this be one Reaſon wherefore our pretenders cannot, as they conceive, have that Purity,

or partake of the Ordinances as they ought, because of Carnall Christians suffered in the Communion of the Church of *England*, and unworthy receivers admitted to the Sacrament: it was long agoe refuted by S. *Austin*, in his learned workes against the *Donatists*, demonstrating by severall places of Scripture, which acknowledge, and by severall parables of our Saviour, which represent the condition of the Church on Earth, to be such for mixture, as a heap of Chaff and Wheat in the same *Floor*, of good Fish and bad in the same *Net*, of Corne and Tares in the same *Field*, and that neither the unworthinesse of the Minister, or of other Receivers, makes Gods Ordinance ineffectuall, or pollutes him that comes in Charity, and with a Conscience undefiled, or cleansed from selfe-pollutions. It is in the power and belongs to the duty of Church-Governours, to cast out the scandalous, or such *as walk disorderly*: but when that is done, it is not for any man to judge, he or she is carnall and unsanctified; for this is to

take

take the Lords Fan out of hand, with which *he will purge his Floor*, Mat. 3. and by breach of charity to offend againſt his Brother: Nay, if that be not done, but that diſorderly perſons are yet ſuffered, and come to the place of Worſhip, yea, to the Lords Table; the guilt reſts upon the Governors that are to ſee to it, the Ordinance is not leſſe effectuall to thee, if by ſelf-conceit and uncharitableneſſe thou render not thy ſelfe uncapable of the benefit, as the *Phariſee* did, when he ſaw the *Publican* in the Temple with him; yea, for any thing thou knoweſt, ſuch a diſorderly perſon may come at that time, when thou art offended with him, as the Publican then did, truly penitent and converted.

§. XI. Triall of Purity of Religion.

In the next place, I would know, what hinderance or prohibition of purity, or ſtrict life, had they in the Communion of this Church? Did the Governors thereof forbid any thing which St. *James* requires to pure Religion (c. 1. ult.) *to keepe themſelves unſpotted of the World*, by *Covetouſneſſe*, *Selfe-ſeeking*, *Swearing*,

ring, Drunkennesse, Lusts of the flesh, the common spots of the World? Or did they forbid *to visit the Fatherlesse and Widdow in their affliction*, or any works of Charity? Might they not have done all these with praise and commendation, had they continued in the Communion of this Church? And for these other exercises of Devotion, *Prayer, Reading, Hearing*, (which though belonging to pure Religion, S. *James* thought good to omit; we shall see the reason of it presently) might they not be had duly, frequently? Was there any thing forbid but the irregular use, or seditious abuse of them? Private Meetings or Conventicles, which were preparatories to Separation and Schism, in a performance of those Duties, to the *despising of the Church*, or publique Assemblies.

But they will say, they could not have these exercises in publique purely administred or performed: that is (as it will appeare below) not according to their own devising and phansie. Good reason there is, that every Christian should have a speci-

al

al care of performing these duties of *Prayer*, *Reading*, *Hearing*: but seeing our Pretenders to Purity seeme to place the summe of Religion in these especially, I would wish them to examine the purity of their Religion, by the Apostles trial of it, *Jam.* 1. *ult.* who thought good to omit the mention of these exercises, because of the *Pharisees*, seeking the esteem of holinesse by such performances, & becaus of Christians then (as now in our Times) resting too much on a fansy of their faith & performance of such Exercises without works and deeds answerable. And therefore the Apostle described *pure Religion*, by such duties (of Charity, & abstaining from all spots of the world or works of the Flesh) as make better proof of the sincerity of Religion.

If the making of *Fatherlesse* and *Widdowes*, the turning men out of their Estates, the invading of other mens Rights, had by the Apostle been made the trial of *pure Religion*, then might the *Contentious* of our dayes have pretended to Purity and Religion; and have *blessed the Lord* that

that they were become rich, though with the spoiling of others, as they did, *Zech.* 11.5. but if Charity, and denying of worldlinesse, and lusts, be the marks, then let them try whether their way of Religion bring forth such fruits, or be in a capacity to do it: When the *Romanists* alledge the many pious and charitable works (as building of Churches, Colledges, Hospitals, Schools, and the applying maintenance thereunto) done by men in their Religion; our pretenders to Purity will be ready to say, it was the Doctrine of Merit that did it; not reflecting upon themselves to consider what kind of Doctrine theirs is, which pulls downe the Monuments of Piety and Charity, and converts the publique to private use. But when we shew that since the Reformation (which cast out *Popish merit*) as many good works (for the computation has been made) done in the like kinde, as have been done in any one Age before: we shew the fruits of our Religion, and challenge theirs, which onely can shew (for their way and do-

doctrines tend to no other iſſue) a diſtempered zeal in deſtroying much of that which before was raiſed to pious uſes, and a ſelf-ſeeking in the enriching themſelves by the ſpoiles. *Swearing* and *drunkenneſſe*, the uſuall and noted *ſpots of the World*, are (as it is fit) very much declined in their way of purity; but the *Phariſee* could ſay more, he was no *Extortioner*, no *Adulterer*; and Saint *James* implied many other ſpots of the World, which *pure Religion* muſt keep a man from: and S. *John*, 1. Ep. c. 2. 16. reducing the *things of the world*, to three heads, makes two of them the *luſt of the Eye*, and *pride of Life*, and therefore tells us, that Coveting, Injuſtice, Sacriledge, and the *Pride* of life, that either cauſes them, or is maintained by them, are the Exorbitant Iniquities of the world, and therefore *Spots*, which by S. *James* his rule, will not conſiſt with *pure Religion*.

I have been the longer upon this Argument, becauſe there is ſcarce any other thing by which the Devil hath gained more, or the Church loſt

loſt more, than by this *pretence of Purity*, the common plea of all Sects in all Times.

Now, as to their Reply above, that they could not have thoſe duties of exerciſes of *hearing*, *praying* in publique, purely adminiſtred, ſatisfaction will be given below, when we come to conſider of the offence they take at the Liturgy, forms of publique Service, Rites and Ceremonies uſed in and about Gods worſhip in this Church. But firſt of their Exceptions againſt the Government it ſelfe; for we charge them of ſeparating, or withdrawing their Obedience from their lawfull Paſtors and Governours. Such as Biſhops were in this, and in all the Catholique Church in all Ages.

§ XI. Their Plea againſt the Government of this Chu.

They plead it is no lawfull government of the Church, but to be caſt out as Antichriſtian. This laſt *contentious* age has called the office of a Biſhop into queſtion, and made a vaſt controverſy of it. I will not follow it at ſtretch, but onely obſerve ſuch grounds as Truth and Peace

Peace ſeems mainly to reſt on, and which every ordinary capacity may underſtand, and receive ſatisfaction ſo far, as to keep himſelf in the unity of the Church.

It is fitting therefore in the firſt place, to remove the prejudice, under which the Adverſaries uſually repreſent *Biſhops* to vulgar eyes: as men ſwell'd with their titles of Honour, large Revenues, attendance of Chancellors, Commiſſaries, Officials, Lording it over the flock not feeding it. Why perſons Eccleſiaſticall ſhould be thought uncapable of the Honour, or unfit for the means which the piety of former times has applyed unto them, out of a religious reſpect, I know no cauſe beſides the ingratitude, and ſacrilegious diſpoſition of this latter Age: But to wave theſe Additionals, as external, to the very office of a Biſhop, and to paſſe by Abuſes, that might be in government, through the iniquity of Perſons and corrupter Times, all which are capable of Reformation by due Authority: that which is concerned in this Controverſy, is the

What is meant by a Biſhop.

the Function, and very office of a Bishop. By that office (be the times what they will) he is set in the Church, as a chiefe or more generall Pastor, within such precincts or compasse (commonly called a Diocesse) having inspection and superintendency (in which stands his Prelacy) over particular Pastors and Flocks, providing or ordaining such Pastors as need requires; and doing all this with the advice and assistance of his Presbyters, or some of the inferiour Pastors (anciently called *Presbyteri civitatis*) and they nothing without him. Such an office will appeare to be conformable as to the perpetuall practise of the Catholick Church, so to the Word of God, and most agreeable to the reason of Church-government, as to the preserving of Unity, and keeping out Schisme, the main concernments of the Church: and therefore they must appeare also highly guilty of Sacriledge and Schisme, that not onely deny obedience to the established Authority of this Office, but have endeavoured to subvert the very Function it self. First,

§. XIII. Episcopall Government is by universall Practise of the Chu:

First, the practise of the whole Church in all Ages is against them. Into this Island the Christian faith was received, if not in the Apostles times (as some think) yet in the next age at fartheſt (as all do acknowledge) and with that faith the government by Bishops was received, and ever since continued; neither did the Catholique Church ever know any other Government till the last hundred yeares. So the force of the Apostles argument, 1 *Cor.* 11.16. falls upon the *Contentious* of this Age, and explodes their new way of ordaining Pastors, and ruling their Churches without Bishops: *The Churches of God never had any such Custome*; yea, in some Councils they declared against it, upon occasion given by the presumption of some Presbyters, that took upon them to ordaine, as in the Case of *Ischyras*, and some others, ordained by one *Colluthus*, who carried himselfe as a Bishop, but was found to be none; in *Athanas. Epist.* certainly the lawfull *Customes* of any Nationall Church, are by the Apostles

ſtles reaſon, binding to all the Members thereof: how much more *Univerſall practiſe*? This the Adverſaries of Epiſcopall-government (whether they be of the Claſſicall, or Congregationall way) turn off with a light finger, as if it had no weight in it; or as if the Apoſtle had ſaid nothing in alledging the Cuſtomes of the Church: Scripture is the onely thing they will be tryed by.

Force of univerſall practiſe or Catholick Tradition.

We refuſe not to meet them there: but let them conſider, that they come againſt the Eſtabliſhed authority of their own Nationall Church, againſt the cuſtome and practiſe, not onely of that, but of all the Churches of God, and there are bound to bring plain and expreſſe Scripture to demonſtrate that Epiſcopacy, or ſuch a ſuperiority over other inferiour Paſtors, or meere Presbyters, is directly unlawfull; for elſe the Cuſtome and Practiſe of the Churches, by the Apoſtles rule, muſt be obſerved, ſo long as in force, *i.e.* till due Authority change them, ſuppoſing they are changeable, and that it is in the power of the preſent Church to change

change them. It were well the Adverſaries of the Epiſcopall Function, would yeild more Authority to Univerſall Practiſe or Tradition of the Churches of God, at leaſt in their reſpect to ſome points they will acknowledge themſelves bound to maintaine: As firſt, *That Scripture is the Word of God.* I do not ask upon what grounds they finally believe this themſelves, but how they would maintaine it againſt Heathen or Jew, and perſwade them to it, but upon the witneſſe of univerſall Tradition, which ſpeaks to the conviction of all men upon the ground of common Senſe or Reaſon, as aboveſaid §. 2. or Secondly, That *the obſervation of the Lords day comes from the Apoſtles.* How would they convince ſuch a one as Mr. *Trask* was, by the places of Scripture, mentioning the Apoſtles meeting upon the firſt day of the week, or that place which names the *Lords day*, *Rev.* 1. which might be on *Eaſter day*, the annuall *Lords day*: He, according to the doctrine of theſe men, ſlighting the Witneſſe of Univerſall Tradition

dition or Practiſe, found nothing in Scripture expreſſe, but the Commandement for the Seventh day, or Jewiſh Sabbath,& ſo obſtinately held for that, till he was reclaimed by the labour and travail of our learned Biſhops, and made to ſee how the continued and undeniable practiſe of the whole Church did clearely ſhew thoſe paſſages in Scripture were intimations of this practiſe then beginning, and that their obſerving of the Seventh day,or Jewiſh Sabbath (for they obſerved that too as occaſion ſerved) was but in complyance with the Jewes for a time, while the Temple ſtood. In like manner, the Univerſall practice of the Church, the beſt interpreter of Scripture (where there is not any place of it ſo plaine as to take away all gainſaying) tells us, thoſe paſſages we ſhew in Scripture for this Government, contain ſo many intimations, and ſometimes exerciſes of that Epiſcopall power, which ſhould continue in the Church after the Apoſtles, and aſſures us, thoſe other inſtances brought by the Adverſa-

ries

ries againſt that Function, cannot inferre any other way of Government. And therefore we had good cauſe to ſay above, Epiſcopall Government was *conformable to Gods Word*: which is our ſecond conſideration.

§. XIV. Epiſcopall goverment conformable to the word.

Secondly then, take we a briefe ſurvey of the Grounds on both ſides, which yet I cannot in reaſon enter upon, without asking leave to ſuppoſe it poſſible (which never was ſeen in any particular) that Univerſall Tradition or Practiſe can be contrary unto Scripture: but yeilding that, as poſſible, to the Adverſaries, it is cleare they are bound as above-ſaid, to demonſtrate this Practiſe or Government, is againſt Scripture, and that their way is peremptorily there preſcribed. How impoſſible it is for them to do this, appeares at firſt ſight, by their ſeverall judgements upon the paſſages of Scripture, concerning Church-government. Some of them look upon theſe paſſages, and think they ſee a *Claſſicall*, or *Preſbyterian*; others of them look upon them, and are as ſtrongly

ſtrongly perſwaded they ſee a *Congregationall*, or *Independent* way. Where's the clear Evidence then, which they pretend againſt Epiſcopall Government? To examine their chiefe Inſtances briefly and plainly, for the ſatisfaction of ordinary Capacities, make the triall of thoſe that are alledged for the Claſſicall way: becauſe that pretends to more regularity, and to a better foundation than the other.

Presbytery Their Inſtances are from the mention made in Scripture, of *Preſbytery* and *Preſbyters*, or *Elders*, and the name of *Biſhop* applyed to them. We read, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. *the laying on of the hands of the Preſbytery*: But what evidence is there in this to demonſtrate, that the power of ordination was put into the hands of meer Presbyters? For firſt, it is a queſtion, whether this *laying on of hands* was for ordination here, or for ſome other purpoſe; *Secondly*, when that is granted, it is a queſtion whether the word *Preſbytery* here, implies the office to which *Timothy* was ordained, or the Perſons ordaining

ning him, for both interpretations are admitted: Thirdly, admit the Persons ordaining are meant, yet never can it be proved they were meer Presbyters; for besides that, the word *Presbytery*, or *Eldership* included, the Apostles, and all the chief Rulers of the Church, (*1 Pet.* 5.1. *who am also an Elder*, and *John Ep.2. v.* 1. *Ep.3.v.* 1. *the Elder*) St. *Paul* saith expresly, he laid hands on *Timothy*, *1 Tim.* 1.6. Neither can they in all Scripture, give one instance of Imposition of hands for Ordination permitted to meere Presbyters alone.

So for the places (alledged by them) mentioning *Bishops* and *Deacons* onely, as the Ministers of the Church, *Phil.*1.1. or calling them first *Elders*, and then presently *Bishops*, *Tit.*1.5.8. *Acts* 20. 17.28. If we say, that in these and the like places, those first Elders set in the Churches, newly planted, were *Bishops* properly; or that the Elders or Bishops there mentioned, were of both sorts, some Bishops properly, some inferiour Presbyters, the Adversaries

Elders and Bishops.

verſaries could diſprove neither part evidently: or if in the third place, we ſhould grant them what they aime at, that theſe were onely Preſbyters, it would be nothing to the purpoſe, unleſſe they could directly ſhew the power of Ordination and Government over thoſe Churches fully committed to them. For ſuppoſing thoſe Elders to be ſuch Preſbyters, the name *Biſhop* might be appliable to any of them, in as much as he had over-ſight of any flock: which Name was appropriated after to the more Generall Paſtor, who had overſight of the Presbyters, and particular Flocks, or Congregations within ſuch Precincts. And what marvail is it, if the diſtinction of theſe two ſorts of Elders or Biſhops, did not, nay could not appeare ſo clearly in the beginning of the new planted Churches, and whilſt the Apoſtles were on earth governing the Churches, as it did after the Churches were enlarged, and the Apoſtles gone off? Then clearly appeared, who ſucceeded them, and how far in that ordinary power

power which was to continue in the Church. For our Saviour left his Apoſtles with full power (extraordinary and ordinary) for the planting and propagating his Church through the World. The ordinary power they were to leave unto others after them, for continuing of his Church to the Worlds end, *viz.* the power of *Reconciliation* in the Miniſtry of the Word & Sacraments, the power of *ordaining* and ſending others, and the power of *juriſdiction* and government. *How, and into what hands they communicated theſe ſeverall powers*, That's the queſtion.

Of the firſt Elders ſet in the Church by the Apoſtles.

Some of the *Ancients* apprehend it thus, That they committed the whole power to thoſe firſt Elders they placed in every City where the Church was planted, ſo that thoſe firſt Elders were properly *Biſhops*, having power to ordain other Miniſters and Labourers, as the encreaſe or extent of the Church required. Other *Fathers*, or ancient Writers, ſeem to apprehend thoſe firſt Elders to be meer Presbyters, to whom the whole power was not committed;

but that afterwards upon the encreaſe of the Church, other ſpeciall Men were intruſted with it to ordain others, as need required, and as Generall Paſtors to rule and over-ſee the whole Church, with all the particular Congregations and Presbyters, or inferiour Paſtors belonging to it. Either way is ſufficient for eſtabliſhing the Epiſcopall power and government, and the Adverſaries thereof, as they cannot diſprove it, if we ſay thoſe firſt Elders were Biſhops properly; ſo neither will they gain any thing, if we grant them in courteſy thus much, that the firſt Elders were meer Presbyters. For ſee briefly what they can ſay againſt the firſt, or draw from the ſecond.

Againſt the firſt they uſually ſay, 1. If thoſe Biſhops at *Philippi* were ſo properly, then were there more than one Biſhop in one City or Church: Anſw. This indeed was abſurd and inconvenient, and never ſuffered in the Church inlarged and eſtabliſhed, but in the Church *Naſcent* or beginning it might be very reaſo-

reasonable by way of provision for the future enlargement & establishment of that Church. So we find 12. Apostles left in the Church of *Jerusalem* by our Saviour, in order to their propagating and governing the Church through the whole World: And so in some great Cities, where and from which the Gospel might suddenly spread it self, the Apostles might provisionally leave more than One Elder vested with power for the supply of the Church enlarged. Secondly, If the Elders or Bishops mentioned in those places, were Bishops properly, vested with such power, then would the Apostle also have remembred the other sort of Elders between them and Deacons. Answ. But what if there were not yet in that Church Elders or Presbyters of the second sort? For no Church at first was full. Or if there were such in that Church, why might he not salute both sorts under that general name, *Bishop*? Thirdly: But then the Apostle did not distinctly set down the Office of the one or the other, for having set

down the office of a Bishop, he presently goes to the Deacon, 1 *Tim.*3. *Tit.*1.5. Answ. It was not the Apostles purpose in those places, distinctly to set down the Office of Elders, nor of Deacons, but the general qualification of the Persons to be admitted to those Offices. We may ask of them, Where has the Apostle distinctly set down, or described the Office of a Lay-Elder? They are fain to force it out of one word *Ruling* (1 *Tim.* 4. 17.) which belongs to the Preaching Elders, as they well acknowledge. In the places above mentioned, the Apostle gives, as I said, qualifications fitting the Persons of both sorts of Elders (that then were, or should be, in the Church) for the duties there hinted, *teaching*, *ruling*, do belong to both sorts of Elders, but with Subordination of the one to the other. And if they will have the word *rule* (1 *Tim.* 4. 17.) insinuate a distinct Office of Elders from the preaching Elders, without any intimation of such an Office any where else in Scripture, why might not we say with more

reason.

reaſon, that the ſame word in the forementioned place (1 *Tim.* 3.5.) belongs to Biſhops of both ſorts, according to their order and ſtation, to *rule* or *take care of the Church of God?* Eſpecially ſeeing we ſhew elſewhere in the ſame Epiſtle, ſuch a Prelacy or ſupereminent power of rule given to *Timothy* diſtinctly from other Elders: as *Lay hands ſuddenly on no man, Rebuke not an Elder,—receive no accuſation againſt an Elder,* &c. cap. 5. v. 19. 22. Like ſpeciall power given to *Titus*, as we ſee in that *Epiſtle*, beſides all the acts of ordinary power exerciſed by the Apoſtles, and not communicated in general to Presbyters. And ſo the exhortation of the Apoſtle, *Acts* 20. 28. might generally fit both ſorts of Elders or Biſhops (ſuppoſing thoſe of the inferiour rank preſent there) that they ſhould all of them *feed the Flock* according to their ſeveral ſtations, and in that ſubordination of Rule which was in the Church.

But if we grant them, that thoſe Elders or Biſhops in the above cited places were not Biſhops properly,

No example or precept in Scripture for the Adversaries pretension.

but ordinary presbyters: What can they draw from thence advantagious either to the *Classicall* or *Congregational* pretension, when as there is no instance in all Scripture of the Power vested in a Classis or consistory of Presbyters, or in every particular Congregation: but on the contrary where ever there is mention of the exercising of the power (for *ordination* by laying on hands, or for *Jurisdiction* in *rebuking* or *receiving accusation* against an *Elder* in *rejecting Heretiks* or the like) we find it always done by the Apostles, or speciall men appointed thereunto, as *Timothy*, *Titus*. Nor is it to any purpose to reply (as they doe) These were extraordinary men, Apostles or Evangelists, and so exercised that power as such: For albeit in the office of Apostle and Evangelist there was something extraordinary, and supposing *Timothy* & *Titus* may passe under the Title of Evangelists, yet the power (of ordination and Jurisdiction) was ordinary, and to continue in the Church, and to be communicated unto others as was most convenient: What help therefore

therefore can the Adverſaries have in the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts being extraordinary perſons, unleſſe they can ſhew the power did ordinarily belong to, and was exerciſed by the company of Presbyters: or elſe demonſtrate it was left in their hands by expreſſe and peremptory order from the Apoſtles. So that here they would be non-ſuited, laying their plea only by Scripture againſt Univerſall Tradition, and practice of the Church; for the Scripture ſtory goes not downe to the departure of the Apoſtles: Now after they were gone off, it clearly appeared by the practice of the whole Church in what hands the chief power and Government was left, *viz.* not to Presbyters in common, but in ſpeciall hands, according to the inſtances and examples of the exerciſing that power in the Apoſtles Time. The Ancient Records alſo which continue the Church ſtory from that Time, give us the ſucceſsion of Biſhops from the Apoſtles in the more eminent Churches, as *Jeruſalem*, *Antioch*, *Rome*, *Epheſus*, *Corinth*, and this practice

and succeſsion ſetled before St. *John* the Apoſtle dyed.

The alteration of Church-government from Presbyterian to Epiſcopall not imaginable.

All which, as it clearly ſhewes thoſe ſeverall *Angels* of the ſeverall Churches, to whom our Saviour by Saint *John* did write, could be no other then ſuch Biſhops, having chief care of and rule in thoſe Churches, & therfore more chargeable with the Corruptions prevailing in them: So doth it clearly convince that plea of the Adverſaries, which amounts to a charging the firſt Biſhops with Uſurpation and invaſion upon the right of Presbyters, or particular Congregations, to be a conceit altogether unreaſonable; for it is beyond all Imagination, that Saint *John* would have ſuffered ſuch an invaſion, or that thoſe firſt Biſhops, who converſed with the Apoſtles and were their diſciples, ſhould make ſuch an invaſion, and immediately ſubvert the Apoſtolicall order pretended for the Presbyterian Conſiſtory: Or that thoſe firſt Biſhops, being holy men, and many of them *Martyrs* (for ſtill we finde the heathen Perſecutors ſought chiefly after the Biſhop of the

the Church, that the chief Paſtor, being ſmitten the flock might be more eaſily ſcattered) ſhould be ſo ambitious and unjuſt; or laſtly, that the Presbyters then ſhould be ſo tame, as not once to complain of the wrong done them, or to tranſmit their Proteſtation againſt it to Poſterity.

To conclude this Tryal by Scripture; It comes to this iſſue: The Adverſaries were bound to ſhew direct Authority of Scripture againſt Epiſcopal Government, it being in poſſeſſion, eſtabliſhed by the continued Authority of this Nationall Church, and which is more, by the perpetuall practice of the Catholick Church; againſt this it was expected they ſhould bring ſome places of Scripture, forbidding that power of Ordination and Juriſdiction to be committed to ſpeciall hands, ſuch as Biſhops properly taken: or commending it to the Conſiſtory of Presbyters, or ſome inſtances at leaſt of that power exerciſed by ſuch a company: Whereas all they can evince out of Scripture, is, that there were Preſbyters

byters (strictly so taken, and of the inferiour rank) which being granted them, we shew there was a Prelacy still over such Presbyters; still there were special men, that had an inspection and rule over them; and when the Apostles went off, the practise of the Church shewes the power was left in the hands of special men, called Bishops properly: So that the Government of the Church by Bishops, appears (as was said above) conformable, not onely to the Universal practise of the Church, after the Apostles time, but also to the Word of God, *i.e.* to the practise and patterns we have there; 1. of our Saviour appointing twelve Apostles, and besides, and under them seventy Disciples of a lower rank; 2. of Apostolical practise, by which we find the power exercised by special Elders, *viz.* the Apostles themselves, or other choice men appointed thereunto by them: whereas all Elders had power of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments: 3. of the several Angels of the several Churches, to whom the Epistles were

were directed, *Rev.* c. 2. & 3. which is the laſt inſtance in holy Writ to this purpoſe.

§. XV. Epiſcopacy moſt agreeable to the reaſon of Church-government.

Laſtly, The Government of the Church, by Biſhops, was ſaid above to be moſt agreeable to the reaſon of Church-government, for preſerving Unity, and excluding Schiſm. This is very obvious in the writings of the Fathers: St. *Cyprian* had much to do with the *Novatian* Schiſmaticks of his time, which cauſed him to write many Epiſtles upon that occaſion, and a Book intituled *De Unitate Eccleſiæ*; wherein he ſhewes the Unity of the Church, as to the preventing of Schiſme, ſtands much upon this, that there be *one Biſhop in one Church.* St. *Hierom* (whom they of the Presbyterian perſwaſion take for their beſt friend, becauſe he ſtrives to advance the Order of Presbyters as much as he can, yet) as he denies the power of Ordination belongs to Presbyters, ſo he acknowledges, that Biſhops were appointed over Presbyters to keep out Faction and Schiſm; that the people ſhould not ſay, as they did.

did at *Corinth*, *I am of Paul*, *I of Apollos*— I of this Teacher, I of that. And for his saying of Presbyters, that they did anciently *communi consilio*, with joint advice rule the Churches, is not to be understood *exclusivè* to the Bishop, for such a time was never known in the Church, but joyntly with him as his Council: so were the *Presbyteri Civitatis* to the Bishop; and their advice was more used (and there was more cause for it) before the many Canons and decrees of Councils gave rule in most particulars what the Bishop should do: as it was by that time S. *Jerom* wrote: and whatever he saith for the advancing of the order of Presbyters, it is but to set them above all Deacons (even those that immediately attended on the Bishop, and, it seems, carried themselves too high) it is not to equal them to Bishops, whose Prelacy St. *Jerome* acknowledged, and thought it very necessary for this purpose of keeping out Schism, which the Parity of Presbyters would expose it to.

And I would appeale to the reason

ſon of any of that perſwaſion, whether it were not more convenient and neceſſary for keeping all in order, to have one aged, grave, learned, and experienced in the way of the Church, to be the ſtanding Moderator of the Claſſis or company of Presbyters, than to change their Moderator year by year, and leave the place open to every young unexperienc'd Presbyter, that can make a faction to advance him unto it: I have heard this inconvenience complained on by ſome of the new erected Claſſes: whereas a Biſhop being ſuch a Moderator as is fixed, and above all competition, is more enabled to keep all ordinary Presbyters in their ſtation, and within their bounds. And then again, I would demand, whether the Apoſtles, who complained of Diviſions, as in the Church of *Corinth*, and of falſe Teachers there and elſwhere, were not careful to provide the moſt reaſonable Expedient in government againſt them? It cannot be denyed; and upon this ſcore, and to this very end of preſerving Schiſm, it cannot be

be thought otherwiſe, but that the Apoſtles gave beginning to this Government throughout the Church.

1. Notwithſtanding thoſe of the Claſſicall perſwaſion, bear themſelves much upon Mr. *Blondels* Collections: whoſe pains might have been better implyed to the uſe of the Church upon ſome other Argument. For in this it is impoſſible to drive out of Antiquity (though ranſaked over again) any more to the purpoſe of the Presbyterian claim, than has been already acknowledged, and the weakneſs of it diſcovered, *viz.* That it ſeems to be the judgement of ſome Fathers, that the name *Biſhop* was at firſt common to all *Elders*, and that thoſe *Biſhops* mentioned *Phil.* 1.1. 1 *Tim.*3. *Tit.*1. were Presbyters, or Elders of the ſecond rank. But what advantage is this to the cauſe they would eſtabliſh, without proving alſo, that the power of Ordination and Government (which we appropriate to *Biſhops* ſtrictly taken) was communicated to Presbyters in common? To the witneſſing of this, it is not poſſible to force Antiquity, no not

not S. *Jerome* alone. All that ſeems to ſpeak any thing that way, amounts but to this: that they were uſed in the Government, and things done with their adviſe and counſel; & that they were more uſed in Ages before St. *Jerome*, than in his time; and there was ſome reaſon for it (as I ſaid) becauſe by that time proviſion was made in moſt Caſes by the many Canons and Conſtitutions of the Church.

§. XVI. Of the ordination of our Biſhops receiv'd from Rome.

There are ſome ſlight exceptions and allegations they make, which are fit onely to take with the ignorant; as that *we* had our Biſhops from *Rome*, but *they* deſire to conform to other Reformed Churches which want Biſhops. They, that cannot diſtinguiſh the Times, ſeveral conditions and concernments of the *Roman* Church may be ſtartled at every mention made of *Rome:* but we are not aſhamed to acknowledge we thence received Biſhops, from whence we received the Chriſtian Faith: both went together (ſame Faith, and ſame Government) firſt in the *Britiſh*, then in the *Engliſh* Con-

Conversion of this Nation; and indeed, in all Nations where Christianity was planted. In the time then of *Gregory* the first, Ordination of Bishops was here received with the Faith, and ever since has been continued from hand to hand in this Nationall Church. Of this seeming prejudice more largely *Tr.*2 *c.*4,5. But to return the Enquiry upon the New Pastors of the New Churches (Classicall or Congregationall.) If it should be demanded, Whence have they their Ordination? They cannot give any reasonable account, nor hold up their heads in the defence of their Pastors and Churches against any *Romanist*, much lesse against any true *English* Protestant or obedient Son of this Church, Challenging them of *Schism* in departing from their lawfull Governors and Pastors, and taking to themselves a Power never given them.

Of other reformed Churches which have not Bishops.

As for the Reformed Churches which have not Bishops, their defect is nothing comparable to the fulnes of the whole Catholick Church, to the practice of which they ought in all

all reaſon to conform: Eſpecially ſeeing thoſe Churches had but tumultuary Reformations; and no marvel then if they were not fully regular in their conſtitution. Nor does the example of thoſe Churches come home to the Caſe in hand; there being a wide difference between *Wanting* or *not having* Biſhops, and *caſting them* out when they have them; Beſides this all the forreign Churches approved Biſhops in this Church, and their moſt learned men acknowledged a want in their own, excuſing it as proceeding of *neceſſity* rather then *choice*, as *Tr.* 2 *c.* 3. Nor can it juſtifie thoſe that divide from us to ſay they joyn with other Reformed Churches; for firſt they muſt anſwer for the *Schiſm* in forſaking the Communion of this Church: and as their Caſe is not the ſame with that of the Churches abroad, ſo cannot thoſe Churches juſtly receive them, having broken the Communion of this. Therefore was it ſo carefully provided for in many Councils of the Ancient Church, that none ſhould travail to any

any forreign Church without his *Communicatory letters* to testifie his Communion with the Church he came from, before he could be received to Communion in the Other. And this to preserve Unity. And thus much touching the Government.

§. XVII. Exceptions in regard of the publick worship.

Now to the usuall exceptions made against the Communion of the Church of *England* in the point of *Publick Worship*, the *Liturgy*, *administration of Sacraments*, *Rites* and *Ceremonies* used in this Church; by reason whereof they could not (as they pretend) Worship God purely in *Spirit and Truth*. This Assembling or meeting together, and joyning in the publick divine Service, especially in the participation of the Sacrament or Eucharist, is indeed the witnessing and exercising of that Communion which is and must be held between all the Members of the same Church: So they. *Act.* 2.42. in such duties and *in breaking of bread*: So the Apostle calls earnestly for it, *Heb.* 10. 25. and *cap.* 13.15 and insinuates the Communion of them that are in the Church,

Chu:by their eating and partaking of *One Altar* (*v.*10.) the participation of that Altar being the Eucharist. And according to this expression, was the phrase of the ancient Church (ἐκτὸς and ἐκτὸς τῦ θυσιαστηρίυ) *to be within or without the Altar, i.e.* in or out of the Communion of the Church, and to *set up Altar against Altar, i.e.* a new Communion against the Communion of the Church. Lastly, the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 17. *One Bread, One Body*: the joynt participation of One Bread, shewes them to be of one Body, holding the Unity of the Church; and withall, it shewes what a dangerous thing it is for any to abstein causlesly, or to separate from the Communion of the Church of which they are Members.

But see in particular what they pretend as Causes of their Separation. There is indeed nothing alledged now, but has been before by the *Contentious*, which have disturbed the peace of this Church from Time to Time, and has been often at large, and learnedly refuted, and those that understand themselves

themſelves, being not ſwayed with faction and paſſion, have received ſatisfaction; but becauſe my intent is ſtill to afford ſome preſent ſatisfaction to them that are now troubled, and more eaſie to be wrought upon, I ſhall briefly and plainly ſpeak to thoſe exceptions againſt our Church-communion, which uſually prevaile with ſuch perſons.

Our Liturgy how agreeing with the Maſs-book.

Firſt that our *Liturgy* or Common Prayer was taken out of the *Maſſe-book*. This is of the ſame ſeaſoning with that of our Biſhops deriving their ordination from *Rome*, fit onely to diſtaſt the weak, who are offended with any thing that ſmells of *Rome*; But as we ſaid of Biſhops, we had them from that Church, from which we received the Chriſtian Faith, and then when we received it: ſo we ſay of our Liturgy, it has no more of the Maſſe, or publique ſervice of the Romiſh Church, than was received and continued from the Ancient Church, and was agreeable to the Chriſtian faith. And to retein ſo much, was according to that Chriſtian Prudence and Charity

Charity uſed in our Reformation, that would have no more oppoſition to them we were forced to differ from, then muſt needs. Whatever the prevailing Errors and Corruptions of After-times had brought into their Maſs, Reformation caſt out: And ſome of thoſe learned Biſhops and Clergy, who were chief inſtruments of the Reformation, and Compoſers of our Liturgy in that frame it had, ſealed the Reformation, and their renouncing of Popiſh Errors with their Bloud: and we challenge them to ſhew any ſuch Popiſh corruption reteined in our Liturgy: and might think it enough to oppoſe the judgement of other Reformed Churches approving it, with which they might alſo reſt ſatisfied, if they did not too much value their own. But more particularly: Two things are conſiderable in *Liturgy*, *Matter* and *Frame*.

§ XVIII Lawfulnes and fulneſs of our Liturgy as to the matter.

For the *Matter* or things prayed for, or ſpoken there, we are aſſured they cannot ſhew any one particular to be contrary to ſound doctrine, or unfitting for Chriſtian men to begg of

of God, and to speake in the serving and Glorifying of him. All suitable to the ends and purposes of the publick Assemblies, and reason of publick Worship; which will appeare if we consider the *Frame*, which implies two things, the *Order* in which it runs, and the *set Forms* in which every thing is expressed. As to the *Order* in which it is framed, what could be more to the purpose of holy meetings and Assemblies? Where Christians come together First, to *confesse* their sins in the presence of God, then to heare the *promise* of the Gospell to their comfort; accordingly after some short exhortation, *Confession* is made, and then a generall *Absolution* pronounced to all that are truly penitent. Again Christians come together to *prayse* God; therefore *Psalmes* are read before, and *Hymnes* used after each Chapter: still concluding the *Psalmes* and *Hymnes* with the *Doxology*, or giving Glory to the whole Trinity, Father Son and Holy Ghost; Furthermore, They meet to shew themselves Christians, and that they Worship God

in

in Christ. Not only by concluding all their Prayers in his name, but also by expresse *profession of the Christian Faith*, according to the Apostles and *Nicene Creed*, to the actuall renouncing of Heresie against the Person of our Saviour Christ. Christians also meet to give thanks for blessings they received, and to beg what they need: accordingly there are severall *prayers* and *Supplications* for the necessities of the Congregation, with *Intercessions* for others: So the Apostle enjoyns 1 *Tim.*2.1. Lastly, They come together to *hear* and receive instruction, for which the Word is both read and preached: besides, a continuall repeating of the ten Commandements, with a suitable deprecation subjoyned to every Commandement. What can be more full, useful and comfortable?

The way of Worship, which they that are gone from us use, as it is defective in many of these (as *Absolution*, *Hymnes*, *profession of Faith*, repeating the *Commandements* of God) so what they have of Confession, Petition or Thanksgiving, is reduced

or ſhuffled up into one continuall Prayer, which, admit it be not defective in thoſe three, yet does it not in ſo convenient a way as the Church of *Engl.* does in diſtinct, ſeverall, conciſe Formes. For ſo it is more intelligible to ordinary capacities, becauſe delivering every part (*Confeſſion, Petition, Thanſgiving*) more diſtinctly: alſo it is more for the holding up intention of the ſpirit, which is more dulled with one long continued Prayer, wherein thoſe parts are confuſed, than if it were broken into ſo many ſeveral Colects or Prayers. I have heard ordinary people acknowledge it, and ſhew themſelves ſenſible of it, complaining, not onely of the *defect* of that Service (for they obſerve they heare not the Lords Prayer, Creed, Ten Commandements, as formerly) but alſo of the *confuſednesſe* of ſuch continued Prayer, which they could not go along with, were not edified by it: whereas before they underſtood ſtill what they were about, and by reaſon of the ſhort expreſſions of the Churches Prayers, and the Reſponſes the people were ſometimes

ſome times to make, they remembred many things. And much they have to anſwer for it, who ſ through, I know not what pretence of the Spirit, or ſpirituall gifts, but indeed through ſelf-conceit, or ſome fleſhly reſpects, have drawn the people from that way of Worſhip, which was more to Gods glory and their comfort and edification.

§. XIX. Set Forms of publick Prayer.

But all thoſe parts of publique Worſhip or Liturgy (which I have inſtanced to ſhew the fulneſſe of that which is uſed in this Church) rre delivered in *ſit Formes*; That they are afraid of, leſt they worſhip God with the inventions of Man: But by this reaſon they ſhould be afraid to pray their own way, leſt they worſhip God with their own invention; or to pray with their approved Miniſters, leſt they worſhip God with their inventions; for the Form or Expreſſion of a Prayer, whether Set, or Extemporary Conception, is equally of mans Invention: and if ſo, ſurely it is better to worſhip God upon a Set, premeditate, and deliberate Invention,

than upon an extemporary one. The truth is, it is not for man to invent that which is of the Substance of Worship, *viz.* the work, act, or Duty directed upon such a due Object, for that is of Gods prescribing, as *Prayer*: but Authority may invent something for the better managing of the work in publique, or for the more convenient performance of the Worship, *i.e.* of the Act or Duty prescribed by God. The Apostle bids it be done in *order*, *decently*, and to *edification*, 1 Cor. 11. *ult.* That *set Formes* may be so, we are assured by those which the Church alwayes had, the Jewish Church had, as see *Numb.* 6. 23. and elsewhere; *John Baptist* taught his Disciples a Form of Prayer, and so did our Saviour teach his, *Luke* 11 1,2. The Practise of the whole Church has approved the use of Set Forms in publique; and so does the judgement and practise of Reformed Churches abroad. Nay, but they will not be satisfied unlesse we shew it to be the practise of the Church in the Apostles time, which they do not finde in

in Scripture. Nay, but they muſt, according to the *Rule* above ſet, not expect the Church ſhould ſhew example in Scripture for every thing ſhe Orders, but they ſtand bound to ſhew it is againſt Gods Word, if they will not yeild obedience, that they may have that warrant againſt Authority, *We muſt obey God rather then Man.* And though we know not whether, or what Forms they uſed in thoſe firſt Times, (for all things they did are not recorded) yet is it no marvel if they did not as then uſe Set Formes, conſidering the condition of the Church, ſmall, and unſetled by reaſon of Perſecution, or the quality of the Perſons miniſtring in it, few, and of extraordinary perfections and gifts for the moſt part.

Whatever judgment theſe men have of Prayer in ſet Forms, or low conceit of them that uſe them: See we how Reaſon evinces the *lawfulneſſe* and *expediency* of them in publique, and therein commends the prudence of the Church in appointing them. 1. As the *matter* or things prayed for, and the *intention* of the ſpirit or affection,

Lawfulneſſe of ſet Formes.

affection, with which they are prayed for, is of the ſubſtance of Prayer: ſo the utterance or words are but externall to it, and therefore Prayer without words, is Prayer truly; Now let the matter of our Prayer be according to Gods will, and the Spirit and affection ſuitable thereunto, and accompanying our Petitions, it is indifferent whether the expreſſion be in our own words, or borrowed; whether in Forms before compoſed, or upon the preſent conceived. Let a man prepare his heart afore-hand ſuitable to the Forms and generall Requeſts, that he knows are made in publique, and God, who is not taken with words or varying of the phraſe, will hear him, as he did the penitent Son, who thought and reſolved before-hand what to *confeſſe*, what to *beg*, *I will go*— and *ſay*— *Luke* 15.18. and accordingly he ſaid when he came into his Fathers preſence. And as our Saviour prayed thrice, *ſaying the ſame words*, *Mat.*26.44. ſo let the ſame affections and deſires of the heart return, or be preſent, they may again be uttered

tered in the ſame form of words: And if the forms of the publique Service do contein (as we ſaid above they do in generall) all the requeſts fitting to be made, then may they ſtill be uſed for the expreſſing ſuch requeſts and deſires.

Here, that they may ſeem to ſay ſomething rather than nothing, they reply; That prayer of the penitent Son, though ſet and before compoſed, was his own, and ſo was that prayer of our Saviour, though ſet, and in the ſame words repeated; but the ſet Forms of the Church are not his prayers that miniſters in the Congregation. If he would utter his own prayers, though ſet and before prepared, they would joyn with him; for then they conceive he prayes, what the Lord has put into his minde, whether upon former premeditation, or preſent conception. Theſe ſeem to be the moſt reaſonable of all thoſe that are againſt the ſet Forms of the Church: for they ſee Reaſon to allow the people to pray in ſet Forms of other mens making, and the Miniſter to pray in ſet Forms

of his own, but not anothers compoſing. Now if they would well examine this, they would ſee little Reaſon upon ſuch a difference to quarrel with Authority, and abſtein from the publick Worſhip of God in his Church: For no ground in Scripture can they have of ſuch a diſtinction, much leſſe warrant upon ſuch a pretended difference to abſtein from Church Communion. Alſo by this reaſon the Miniſter ſhould not uſe the Lords prayer, becauſe not of his own compoſing. Again, this is to place the ſubſtance and effect of prayer in Frame of Words, rather than in matter or things prayed for, and the ſuitable affections of the heart: both which may be found right in uſing Forms compoſed by others. For the matter of the Church Forms it is plain, there is nothing but according to the will of God, and if he that uſes them prepare his heart with ſuitable affections, God requires no more. The prophet bids, *Take words with you — and ſay, Take away all Iniquity*, &c. *Hoſ.* 14. 2. If then the heart be prepared with ſuch motions

tions and desires as are fitting for Confession and petition, is it so materiall whence *we take the words*; either suggested to us by others, as it is there, or invented by our selves? Surely if the people can better understand the things prayed for, and better prepare their hearts with suitable affections, when the set Forms of the Church are used, than they can when they hear the Ministers Prayer: (which they can, by reason Those Forms contein all necessary requests, better than any one mans prayer can probably do; and because the publique prayers being necessarily expressed in generals, the people ought still, from those general Confessions or Petitions, to reflect upon their own particular Sinnes, Infirmities, Wants and Desires) it is therefore most reasonable the people have the Publique prayers in the Set forms, with which they are best acquainted, which speaks the *expediency* following.

II. They are not Lawful, but Expedient too in publick; Every particular man, as he best knowes his

Expediency of set Forms in publick.

Expediency of Set Formes in publique.

his private Neceſſities, ſo he may expreſſe them in private to God as his heart ſuggeſts: but in publique it is neceſſary that the requeſts of and for the whole Congregation, ſhould be in general expreſſions, ſuch as may comprehend the neceſſities, and concernments of all: and it is needful this be done in ſet forms, prudently and godlily compoſed, not left to the conceptions and inventions of ſo many thouſands as miniſter in this Nationall Church, and are to be the Mouth of the Congregation to God; for though ſome may do it diſcreetly, yet would many inconveniences follow through the different performance of others, 1. Want of Uniformity in the publique Worſhip of the ſame Church. 2. Defect often in not putting up all the requeſts, which are fitting to be made, not doing all that is fit to be done at publique meetings to the glory and worſhip of God. 3. Many Impertinencies, Tautologies in expreſſion, ſometimes unfitneſs, and unlawfulneſs of that which is ſpoken, ſuch as the Congregation cannot ſay

ſay *Amen* to. A difference there is betwixt Liberty in this performance of publique worſhip, and of preaching; for the Worſhip and Prayers are preſented immediately to God himſelf; but preaching, though it treats of things pertaining to God, yet ſpeaks to the people: To the Prayers of the Church, the whole Congregation is to ſay *Amen:* but that which is delivered in preaching, falls under trial and examination, whether it be ſo: For providing and delivering a Sermon to the people, they have liberty of time as they pleaſe, & of uſing what means & help they pleaſe: but as for the putting up the prayers of the Congregation, whereſoever there is a deſpiſing of ſet Forms, and an expectation of private Conceptions from the Miniſter, there the former inconveniences will often be run into by ſome, through ſelf-conceit of Gifts, and Pride of ſhewing them in variety of Expreſſions, and length of Prayers by others, through diſability and weakneſs; yet thinking themſelves concerned in reputation to follow the former,

former, & to attempt the like way of a seeming extemporary long Prayer.

Spirituall gifts to be used, but with submission to the Church:

Notwithstanding they plead for Liberty in using the spiritual Gifts they have, to the edifying of the Church. for to that end they are given, and the Apostle bids to use them to that purpose, 1 *Cor.* 14. True, but first they must observe a difference between the Gifts then, and now, and know that all were to be used with submission to the Church: The Gifts then were extraordinary, by special affiation or revelation of the spirit: spiritual gifts now are ordinary, from the operation and motion indeed of the same spirit, but upon use of means. Therefore they which strive to order their Assemblies according to the particular passages of that Chapter, doing in them, as then was used, cause great confusion and ridiculous deportment in their holy meetings. But secondly, if the Apostle give restraints there (as he doth) to those spiritual gifts, though extraordinary, that they be used with submission to the Church, as is thought fit for order

der and edification, much more the uſe of Gifts now ought to be limited. Elſe may women that are gifted, take the liberty of uſing them in the Church; but the Apoſtle ſaw Reaſon to impoſe Silence upon them in the ſame Chapter, or at leaſt every man that has gifts may uſe them (as ſome now plead for the Liberty) to the edification of the Church: but many of thoſe who are againſt Set Forms, ſee great reaſon againſt that too, thinking it fit (as indeed it is) that none ſhould uſe their gifts publiquely, but ſuch as are called, allowed, and ordained to it by the Church; and if ſo, then alſo ſhould they think it fit, that thoſe, who are ſo allowed, as publique Miniſters in the Congregation, ſhould uſe their gifts ſo, and in ſuch a way, as the ſame Church ſees fit and allowes: for if theſe will plead liberty of uſing their ſpirituall Gifts againſt the Conſtitution of the Church, and that by this 14. chapter to the *Corinthians*, then may the other with as good Reaſon plead Liberty for all gifted men; for all that had

had such gifts (as here the Apostle speaks of, and seeks to order) might have their turn of speaking and using them.

But they are both out of the way, and inconsequent in their reasoning from this Chapter, not distinguishing Times and Gifts, nor acknowledging duly the Authority of the Church; and therefore under pretence of such Gifts, pleading for Liberty of using them, that is, as it often proves of venting what they please in the Congregation; whereas they ought in all humility, to expect the Churches approbation of their Gifts, and then know they must use them with submission still to the Church, in such a way as is thought most fit for preventing the above-mentioned inconveniences, for preserving *Order* and *Unity* in the Church, for setting forth an *Uniformity* in Gods Worship, and upon all these respects for *edification* of the people. *Calvin*, no friend to Popery, or sloathfulnesse in Ministers: but a person furnished with as great gifts as any of our Pleaders for th isLiberty can pretend

to

to, is said to have often wished, that all the Churches had one and the same Form of publique Service or Liturgy, and that upon these Reasons, The holding of Unity in the Church, and the excluding of Novelty, Faction, and boasting of Gifts.

But see whether this Pride of spirit, and self conceit (for I can call it no otherwise, when once it sets it self against the Churches constitution without expresse Scripture) has proceeded in some, from a despising of the Churches Prayers to an understanding of the *Lords Prayer*, because a Set form, and to a neglecting the use of it altogether as far below them; then to a conceiting of themselves to be above prayer it self, as needing not to pray at all. Such I have met with, miserably cutting themselves off, not onely from the comfort of the prayers of Christs Church on Earth, but from the benefit of his intercession in Heaven, and evacuating (as to themselves) the eternal Priesthood of Christ: for if they need not pray, they need

Lords Prayer undervalued, neglected.

need not confesse, nor ask forgivenesse, nor beg Grace or any spirituall help, and so need not the Intercession of Christ for obteining such mercies; for his being our *Advocate* 1 *Joh.* 2. 1. supposeth our *Confession* of sin, required *c.* 1 *v.* 9. and his being our *High Priest* inferrs *our coming to the Throne of Grace, Heb* 4. 16. or *our coming to God by him, Hebr.* 7. 25. And as for those that so much prize the prayers of their owne conception to an undervaluing of that, which the Lord framed and taught us; let them consider how little they deserve his Intercession, when they come by him to put up their owne prayers, despising or wilfully neglecting his. But we knowing the perfection of that prayer, which conteins all things fitting to be asked, doe often use it in the publick prayers of the Church, and alwayes with our own, that if any thing needfull be through our imperfection Omitted in our own, it may be supplyed in the use of that, and knowing that Christ is ready to hear & receive the

the requeſts of every humble ſpirit, which is carefull to doe, and make uſe of what he has taught us, We therefore delight to expreſſe, or to ſum up our deſires often in his form of words; for as Saint *Cyprian* in his expoſition of the Lords prayer, tels us, Chriſt when we beg his interceſsion uſing that prayer, will acknowledge his own Words, will remember the prayer he taught us. Thus much of *ſet Forms*, and Prayers of the Church.

§.XX. Exception againſt Rites and Ceremonies.

They farther pretend, they cannot hold Communion in the publick Worſhip of God, according to the way and form of the Church of *England* by Reaſon of Rites and Ceremonies uſed therein. Here they are chiefly offended, at the *Habit* of the Miniſter, *ſtanding up at* Creed and Goſpel, *Ring* in Marriage, *Croſs* in Baptiſm, *Kneeling* at the Lords Supper, *Bowing* at the Name of *Jeſus*. And the reaſon of their offence is, becauſe they take them to be *Burthenſome*, and therefore againſt Chriſtian Liberty, yea, *Superſtitious*, and therefore againſt purity of Worſhip.

For

Not burthensome or superstitious:

For the first; Where Ceremonies are burthensome for Number, it is a fault in that Church, and cause of offence and complaint, but not of separation or breaking Communion: St. *Augustine* in his *Epist*: to *Januar*: took notice of the encrease of Ceremonies then, and in part complained, they began to be burthensome; in the *Church* of *Rome*, the number was excessive before Reformation, and gave just. Cause to complain of the burthensom observance of them; but that was not any Cause of dividing Communion, had they not beene (many of them) burthensome for *Weight*, as well as for *Number*, and insupportable by reason of apparent *superstition*. Now the Ceremonies and Rites reteined in this Church were few for number, and eased of that weight or superstition that was in any of them. The truth is, if the Pretenders of Liberty of Conscience do therefore quarrel at our Rites and Ceremonies, as contrary to Christian Liberty, because appointed and enjoyned by the Church, they do plainly shew they *use that Liberty as*

a

a Cloak for their unruly and contentious Spirits, that cannot abide the commands of Authority, but would do every thing according to their own deviſing, and will (when they have power) impoſe ſeverely Orders and Conſtitutions of their own; for ſo they do where they can erect their new Communions: impoſing Conditions of admittance into, and of Continuance in that Communion, ſuch as they think good: but ſuch as Chriſt or his Apoſtles never required, ſuch as the Catholique Church never knew: as for example, *their Triall by Lay-Elders*, and denial of Communion or Church-fellowſhip, yea, of the Sacrament of Chriſts Body and Blood to him that will not undergo that Triall, or is not approved by it according to thoſe rules they pleaſe to uſe, but is found unanſwerable to that meaſure of knowledge or gifts, which they expect; of which and other devices of theirs, we may ſay as the Apoſtle did, 1 *Cor.* 11.17. *We have no ſuch Cuſtome, nor the Churches of God.*

But

But in the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England* they finde *Superstition*; and why? because such Rites and Ceremonies were derived from, and abused in Popery unto Superstition. They were used indeed in the Church of *Rome* (and abused too) but derived from the Ancient Church, and used by it to good purpose before Popery crept in. Nor is it a good Rule of Reformation to cast out whatever has been abused by Popery; we need not do it to the very same individual things which have been so abused, (excepting Images (as the *Brazen Serpent*) that had been *objectively* used to Superstition) for the same individuall Churches stand, which I suppose they hold, were abused in time of Popery; much lesse are we bound to abolish all Rites and Ceremonies which have been abused onely *in specie*, in their kind, the individuall act or performance of them under that abuse being transient and not remaining. But the Rule of our Reformation was still according to Christian prudence & charity,

ty, not making moe differences than must needs; & therefore retaining the use of that which Antiquity, with good reason, practised, but without the after-abuse; & looking not onely at ancient Practise, but the Apostles Precept, according to which the forementioned practises tend to *order* & *decency*, and as far as Ceremonies are capable of it, to edification.

Thus much the Church has sufficiently declared by her Doctrine, & by hundreds of books written upon that argument, that she enjoyns these Rites and Ceremonies cleared from all superstitious abuse, either of yeilding worship to any *undue ob ect*, or of affixing any *Sacramentall Efficacy* to any of them, or of giving them any *spirituall Vertue*, either to *better the duty*, to wch they are joyned (professing the duty is good without thē, though not so orderly and reverently performed) or to *satisfie* by such performances; or that she has any other superstitious respect in the enjoyning of them, but regard onely to the aforesaid precept for *order* and *decency*, which easily appeares in the more solemn

Vse of Ceremonies significant.

solemn and reverent performance of the duty with these Rites than without them, and for edification, according to the nature of a Ceremony, by its signification, minding us of some duty. (To this purpose, *Treat.* 2. c. 7. num. 7. of Ceremonies significant.) *Peter Martyr* said well in his Comment on that 14. chap. to the *Corinths*: *Ceremonies are more commendable, if they do admonish us, (Instar concionum de aliquo officio) like Sermons of some duty.*

As for example, that women should be *covered* in the Congregation, was not onely for *decency*, but signified and minded them of *Duty, viz.* Subjection, as the Apostle shewes, 1 *Cor.* 11. The Ceremony of the *Holy Kisse* used in their meetings, and enjoyned by the Apostle several times; *minded* them of that Charity which should be among Christians, and *testified* they had it then for each other. So *the putting off the Old man*, so oft mentioned in the Apostle, was the duty: and it was represented in Baptism, by their putting of Old clothes, and putting on New. Such signification

ſignification has the *White Veſture*, minding both the People of the holy duties they come to, & him that wears it, of the holineſſe required of them that miniſter in holy Duties. *Standing up* at the Creed is for a more ſignificant profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, that they acknowledge and receive it, and will, by the help of God, ſtand to it and defend it: The like ſignification is in ſtanding up at the reading of the Goſpel. The *Ring* in Marriage added onely as a viſible Symbol of that Union and Conjunction, and for remembrance thereof is it ſo carefully kept and worn ever after. What the *Croſſe* in Baptiſm ſignifies, and wherefore it is uſed, is there and then expreſſed, when it is uſed, *in token* that the party baptized *ſhall not be aſhamed of the Croſſe of Chriſt* &c. The Ancient Chriſtians uſed to make the ſign of the *Croſs* (upon occaſion) in the ſight of the Heathen, to witneſs or ſpeak the profeſſion they were of; and I doe not doubt the truth of thoſe Ancient Records that tell us how God was pleaſed ſometimes (for the

Standing up at Creed.

Ring in Marriage.

Croſs in Baptiſme:

the conviction of the Heathen, and the approving of the Christian profession) to work a miracle at the making that Sign: and what marvel, when for the same purpose he wrought miraculously at the falling of *Peters shaddow* upon the sick, and at the touch of *handkerchiefes* brought from *Pauls* body, *Act.* 5.15. & 19.12. He that purposely uses the sign of the Crosse to work supernaturall effects, does it without warrant Superstitiously: So he that affixes any Sacramentall vertue or spirituall efficacy to it in baptism; The Church of *England* has no such respect, but only uses it as a bare Ceremony, for remembrance and testification of that which indeed is every Christian mans duty, *viz. Not to be ashamed of the Crosse of Christ, but to fight manfully under his banner* &c. And truly (considering what a pass Christianity is at among us, how the very principles thereof are so openly overthrown by Sacriledge, Injustice, Atheism: that they are likely (if men go on) to be forgotten in the next age, that there may now seem to be some

Cause

Cauſe to have the Croſſe of Chriſt imprinted with fire (as they ſay the *Ethiopick* Chriſtians doe) upon the fore-heads of the Children: that they may remember ſo oft at leaſt as they look in the Glaſſe, that they are Chriſtians, and what they promiſed in baptiſm.

Kneeling at the Communion, can be no compliance with Popery in the acknowledging of *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *Adoration* of the Hoſt; for our Church has ſufficiently declared againſt the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; which being taken away, that Adoration falls. Nor yet is their *Kneeling* in the Romiſh Church the Teſt and acknowledgement of *Tranſubſtantiation*, or of that Adoration (which they think due to the Hoſt) but their *falling down*, when it is elevated or lifted up. They do Popery too much honour, that make the devout and lowly behaviour of *kneeling* at the Sacrament, proper to that Religion, and do ſeem not to underſtand themſelves, nor what they are about (in that application of the ſoule to God, and the receiving Kneeling at the Sacrament.

ving from him the greateſt pledges of mercy) that think not the moſt humble and reverent geſture moſt fit for ſuch a Duty. Their ſitting mentioned, *Mark* 14. 18. *As they ſate and did eat*, &c. does not ſpeak directly the geſture they uſed at receiving the Lords Supper, but their falling to, or applying themſelves to eat the Paſſeover; and whether in the receiving the Sacrament they uſed the ſame poſture which they cõmonly did at their Feaſts (a kind of lying or leaning, more neer to a proſtration of the Body than our ſitting) is not certain; but no queſtion they uſed ſuch expreſsions of devotion then, as were ſuitable to the preſent duty. Nor muſt our application to Chriſt now be after ſuch a common and familiar way, as theirs was, when he converſed with them on Earth: They did not then ſo pray to him, or *asked in his name*, as they did afterwards, *Jo*: 16.24. They know Chriſt then after the fleſh, familiarly converſing with him, but now *we know him ſo no more*, 2 *Cor*. 5. 16. He is now in Heaven at Gods Right Hand, we on Earth;

Earth: and if we underſtand Him and our ſelves, how, when we are admitted to the Sacrament, we are applying to God by him, and receiving from God through him the greateſt benefits: we cannot but think there is cauſe for the greateſt expreſſion of our moſt humble acknowledgments.

Bowing at the Name of JESUS, is by the Church appointed to be done ſometimes in publick Divine Service, as an acknowledgment of his Deity, his Exaltation and Lordſhip over all, (ſet out *Act.* 2. 36. *Phil.* 2. 11.) and that we are his poor devoted Creatures, whom he has made and redeemed: It is a divine worſhip (ſtanding in ſuch inward acknowledgment and honour, and outward bowing of the body) given to the Perſon of Chriſt, known by that Name; and it is ſtrange if any Chriſtian ſhould deny it lawfull to worſhip and adore our Saviour Chriſt at any time, eſpecially to doe it when he is named, conſidering what the Apoſtle alſo ſaith, *Phil.* 2. 10. which muſt needs infer at leaſt, that *it may be* Bowing at the name.

done, when he is named. So here is no new Worſhip invented by the Church, (for the Worſhip then given is due to God, and preſcribed by him) but the performance of it onely determined, when it ſhall be given or expreſſed, *viz.* at the Name of *Jeſus*, or when he is named.

As for that precept of the Apoſtle, *Abſtain from all appearance of evill*, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 22. which they make a pretence for their declining of the Rites and Ceremonies of this Church: It gives direction for private practice in things left indifferent to our choice, in the occurrencies of life; gives no warrant againſt Authority, to uſe liberty, in things determined thereby, under pretence of *appearance of evill* in them, as ſaid *Treat.* 2. *cap.* 1. For here we are ſtill bound (according to the Rule often above delivered) to ſhew the thing enjoyned by Authority, is (not onely in *appearance*, but) *indeed evill*, in it ſelf formally, or forbidden by Gods poſitive command.

Again, The Rites, Ceremonies, and Practices of this Church, have not (to

(to any judgement cleared from Paſſion, Prejudice, or Faction) an *appearance of evil* in them, *i. e.* of Superſtition or Wil-worſhip, as they fancie ignorantly or wilfully, but of *good, i. e.* of *order, decency, reverence, devotion*, expreſſion of the *duty* we are about, and of the *internal worſhip* then yeelded: Of all which, there is a fairer *appearance* in the communion of this Church, than in the confuſed and irreverend deportments of their Aſſemblies.

§. XXII. Touching the point of worſhip.

Now to the end that they which underſtand not ſo much as they ſhould in the points of Worſhip and Adoration, may better conceive what error and offence they run into by their cauſeleſſe and inconſiderate feare of Superſtition in many juſt and lawfull practices of the Church: I muſt firſt tell them, that by their abſtaining from the publick ſervice of God, becauſe the Prayers are in Set-forms, by their not comming to the Communion, becauſe to be received Kneeling; by withholding their Children from Baptiſme, rather than they ſhould be ſigned with the croſſe

and the like, they make themſelves guilty of wilfull neglect of duty to God, of obedience to the Church, and fall into that ſuperſtition, which is called Negative: For they place Religion in not doing theſe, account themſelves therfore godly and pure, and make ſuch abhorring or abſtinence from theſe, a mark of their Religion or Sect: And then, that may better underſtand themſelves in the point of *Worſhip*, they ought to put a difference between the *Subſtance*, and the *Circumſtantials* of Worſhip. The Subſtance of Worſhip ſtands (as ſaid above) in a due act, (internall, externall) directed on the due object; and this is of Gods preſcription: The Circumſtantials of Worſhip are ſeen in the decent and profitable managing of the Worſhip for *Time*, *Place*, *Order*, or the like; and in theſe the Church has power. Again, Worſhip is determined *Objectively* to ſuch or ſuch a thing or perſon receiving the worſhip, or *Circumſtancially*, *ad hic & nunc*, to the time and place; The Church has no power in the firſt, cannot transferre any

Circumſtantialls of VVorſhip.

Objective terminations of VVorſhip, and Circumſtantiall.

any religious worſhip upon an undue Object; but has power in the Second, may appoint *when* and *where*, and *by whom*, and on *what occaſion* the worſhip due to God, and preſcribed by him, ſhall be performed in publick. For *Words* that are heard, and *Things* that are ſeen, carrying in them a remembrance of *benefits* and *duties*, and therefore *Motives* of Worſhip to God, who gives the benefit and expects the duty, may *determine* our Worſhip to time and place, inciting us to perform it *then* and there, *when* and *where* we hear ſuch Words or ſee ſuch Things: and this is a Circumſtantiall determination of Worſhip, not an *Objective*.

When the people heard *Moſes* words, *they bowed the head and Worſhiped*, *Exod.* 12.27. What! not the *Words* which *Moſes* ſpake, but they worſhipped the *Lord* upon hearing ſuch words as conteined ſuch Motives of Worſhip. In that Idolatrous Worſhip, *Dan.* 3. at the hearing of the Inſtruments of Muſick they fell down &c. The Worſhip was not given to the ſound, but at the ſound to Inſtances.

the Idol erected, the ſound of that Muſick did onely *circumſtancially* determine the Worſh p, but the Golden Image *Objectively*, and that made the Idolatry. So when religious worſhip (for the reaſon is alike) is given to our Saviour Chriſt, upon the hearing of his name *Jeſus*, not letters and ſyllables of his Name, but the Perſon of our Saviour is the Object of the Worſhip; and the naming or ſpeaking of his Name *Jeſus* (which notes his Perſon, and withall carryes in it the remembrance of that Salvation he wrought for us, and therefore the greateſt Motive of worſhip) does determine the Worſhip Circumſtantially, *i. e.* the performance of it to ſuch a time or occaſion.

So for *Things* ſeen, which bear the remembrance of ſuch benefits, as may give *Motive* of Worſhip, and determine it, not *Objectively* but *this way* rather then that. The *Ark* with the *Mercy ſeat* was the ſign and witneſſe of Gods preſence, (*there I will meet with thee, and commune with thee. Exod* 25.22.) and therefore they worſhipped towards it.

Worſhip

*Worſhip at his footſtoole. Pſ.*99.5. and 132.7. So it was called becauſe of the ſpeciall exhibition of his preſence on Earth. Now the worſhip was not given to the *Ark* Objectively, but to God: only that way, or thitherward rather then other. Thus *Daniel* prayed towards *Jeruſalem* — *c.*6.10. And ſhould any (that I may ſpeak of *Rites* not enjoyned by this Church, yet practiced by ſome, and no queſtion piouſly) pray as the Ancient Chriſtians did, towards the Eaſt, in acknowledgement of the light of the Goſpel riſen upon them; or at their comming into Gods houſe bow themſelves in ſenſe of the great preſence, and of the holy duties they come to, and of their own unworthineſſe; or in their approach to the holy Table bow or proſtrate themſelves to the ground, in acknowledgement of that ſpeciall exhibition Chriſt makes of himſelfe there, and in ſenſe of his own unworthineſs; what Chriſtian that underſtands himſelf, could accuſe theſe of ſuperſtition and Popery, or not rather approve them as ſignificant and

ſeemly expreſſions of Chriſtian devotion?

There is a Cuſtom of uncovering the head at the coming in of light, if this be done with *thankfulneſſe* of ſoul for the light of the Goſpel, and *deſire* of enjoying the light of heaven, what harm? Is it not lawfull, yea Chriſtian-like to glorify God on all occaſions? for the comming in of the light is but an occaſional remembrance. Let me put it to them farther; ſhould a Papiſt when he uncovers the head or bows the body at the ſight of a *Croſſe*, doe it out of hearty thankfulneſs to God for redemption by Chriſt Crucified; making the *Croſſe* no object of the Worſhip, but only the ſight of it an occaſionall remembrance and motive: would there be any thing in this unbeſeeming a Chriſtian? I cannot but ſay it concerns a Chriſtian often to remember, and thankfully to acknowledge Gods mercies upon any occaſion: and if the inward worſhip (which ſtands in ſuch due acknowledgments of the heart) may upon occaſionall remembrances be given, then may the

the outward expreſſion alſo by uncovering the head or bowing the body, unleſſe *prudence* out of reſpect of time or place forbid it, for *Religion* will not. And to come a little more home to thoſe that are ſo ready to cry ſuperſtition: ſhould any one of them eſcape a ſhipwrack or hazard of battail, or be redeemed out of Turkiſh ſlavery; and ſo oft as he hears of other mens ſuffering in any of theſe kindes, or ſo oft as he ſees a ſhip ſafe in harbour, or lookes on the Armour he wore in that battel, or on the Chain he bore in Captivity, ſhould he ſo oft uncovering his head lift up his heart to God in thankfull acknowledgement of the bleſſing, and deſire of farther Protection: would there be any thing in this, but what beſeems a good Chriſtian, when as neither *words* heard, nor things ſeen are made any object of the worſhip, but accaſionall remembrances, and motives? How much rather may this be done, when we hear that name, which carries ſalvation in it, ſee thoſe things which minde us of the greateſt mercies, and therefore

may

may move us: and all this the more if the Prudence and Authority of the Ch: has so determined. I have enlarged this discourse to instances beyond the enjoyned Rites and practises of this Church, to meet with that vain plea of superstition and Popery charged upon it, for the better countenancing of the Schism made, and the sacrilege committed in these our dayes.

§. XXI. Cause of their several Error, that have divided from this Church.

To winde up all. By that which has been said, it may appear, what is the *Cause* of this Error, (which carries so many such severall wayes from the Communion of this Church) and what the *Issue* of it. The Cause is their misunderstanding of the *Rule* by which they should be guided. First of the supreme *Rule*, the *Scripture*, which for faith and substance of worship is a set and punctuall Rule, not so for other matters of practice. Secondly, of the next, and as I may say, Secundary *Rule* the witnesse of *Universall Custome, practice* or *Tradition*, which (as unfolded above § 2. & 13.) is the best externall proof of Scripture, so also the

the beſt expoſitor of it: bringing down nothing as of the ſubſtance of Faith and Worſhip, but what is clearly grounded on Scripture, and giving clear light to thoſe darker paſſages in ſcripture, which concern the beginnings of ſome Practiſes, which were to continue in the Church, as *Infant baptiſm*, Obſervation of *Lords day*, *Eaſter*, *Pentecoſt*, *Epiſcopal Government*. Thirdly their miſunderſtanding of the Authority of the preſent Church, *defining in* matters of faith and worſhip according to direct Scripture, and *decreeing* in other matters according to prudence: but in both having reſpect to, and in a due ſort guided by *Univerſal conſent*, or Tradition of the Catholique Church, *viz.* the *Doctrines* that have been always taught, and the *Cuſtomes* or *Practices* alwayes obſerved therein. For let men forſake the guidance of theſe *Rules*, and what remains but the extravagancie of a private judgement? and what can follow but error upon error? and what can be the iſſue of that, but remedileſſe confuſion?

Hence

Hence have we so many *private interpretations* of Scripture, broached instead of *Catholick doctrine*; *Circumstantials* of Worship taken for *Substance*, and thereupon the lawfull Worship of the Church ignorantly charged with Superstition. And for matters of *Practice*, some will have all practices observed they meet with in Scrip: Some not all, but not any else, save what is there. Lastly, upon the like mis-understanding, they cast out the perpetuall government of the Church, but cannot agree what to set up: in this, as in many other things, following their private judgement, destitute of the guidance of the former *Rules*, and therefore upon necessity disagreeing: one destroying what the other would build; yet all pretending (for *Satan* is here an *Angel of light*) to set up the *Discipline*, *Scepter*, and *Kingdome* of Christ, and to advance *Purity* of Religion. This was the pretence of all Schismaticks, and it is the Master-piece of Satans cunning (as above noted, §. 8.) to set men on work under that pretence, but with mis-

Confusion the Issue of Error, having passed due bounds.

miſ-guided zeal, to purge, reform, refine a Church, and to out-ſtrip others in that zeal, till they have brought all to confuſion. But *we ſhould not be ignorant of his devices*, as the Apoſtle warns them in a caſe not much unlike, 2 *Cor.* 2. 11. for *Satan* was there playing his part as *an Angel of light*, under the pretence and covert of ſeverity and ſtrictneſſe againſt the Inceſtuous perſon; as he did after in the *Novation* Schiſmaticks.

Theſe his *devices* we might indeed have ſeen in thoſe Ancient Schiſmaticks, *Montaniſts*, *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*: and in thoſe more irregular of the laſt Age, *Anabaptiſts*, *Libertines*, *Familiſts*, and the like; whoſe Errors and Follies were well ſilenced by Learned Proteſtant Writers, but now broken out again, when *that which did let* (the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Authority) *was taken away*, or ſo weakned, that it could not ſtop the inundation of former Errors and exorbitant phanſies flowing back upon us from every corner, into which they had retired; and working apparently

Confusion & levelling upon level-ling.

parently to confusion, to a *levelling* upon *levelling*, as in the *State*, so in the *Church*-government and affairs. The consideration of the first is not to my present purpose; but as for the busineſſe of the *Church* and *Religion*, I cannot but note, How they, who first pretended to Reformation, (by *Covenant* obliging themselves and others, and conceiving that *Cov.* in such generall terms, as might engage men of all sects and perswasions to joyn with them in pulling down what was establisht, & invading the means and revenues belonging to *Cathedral* Churches) did not or would not (I pray God they may yet) see *Satans device*, by like principles and pretences, and in such general words to have still a new Reformation undertaken, and to *level* or pul down not onely what the former had built, but what they had left standing of that which was before. The first pretenders to Reformation, would cast off *Bishops* (their lawfull Pastors and Superiours) invade their power of Ordination and Government, & have their Revenues with those of Deans and

and Chapters alienated; Now are there riſen up men that would make it a part of their Reformation, to caſt off the Miniſtry of *Presbyters* too, laying open the Office of Teaching to all gifted men: alſo to take away their *Tithes* and maintenance, putting them to live upon benevolence, if any will have them for their Teachers. And as the firſt had no conſideration of the *Cathedral* Churches, no more have theſe of the *Parochial*: but as if all other Chriſtians were *Infidels* or *Heathens*, they will *gather Churches* anew: the ready way to diſſipate the Church of Chriſt, and bring in *Confuſion*: But furthermore, as the firſt Reformers of theſe dayes, would have no reſpect to the Ancient practice of the Catholike Church, ſo have theſe as little regard (and with farre greater reaſon) to the pattern of the other Reformation, the *Scottiſh Kirk*. Laſtly, As They firſt caſt out Set-forms, and the Publick prayers of this Church, ſo Thoſe that came after, have caſt out their

their *Directory*, will not be bound up by their Rules and Order: but as one Error begets another, and is boundleſs in its progreſs, ſo here from deſpiſing the Set-forms of the Church, they proceed to an undervaluing the *Lords Prayer*, as below them; and ſome to advance themſelves above Prayer it ſelfe, as needleſſe to them, in that height of perfection they conceive themſelves to have attained: and this is the chiefe aime of *Satans device*, to bring men by a miſguided purſuit of purity and holineſſe, to ſuch a pitch of ſpiritual pride and ſelf-conceit, as if they had *already apprehended* — which S. *Paul* would not take to himſelf, *Phil.* 3.13.

Nor is it ſufficient to ſay, We are not ſo: If you are not gone ſo far, yet like Principles and Pretences, which you went on againſt the Government, and Lyturgie of this Church, would carry you ſo far; for what certain bounds are left to ſtay any, when once ye have pull'd up thoſe, that the above mentioned Rules fixed? This being done in that Covenanting pretended Reformation, the

the way is laid open to others more bold and heady, to run on farther.

But let me argue it a little with you, (you, that pretend to more regularity and order in the *Classical* or *Congregational* way, and make shew of a more quiet spirit and temper) and challenge you a little, as our Saviour did the Scribes and Pharisees roundly, (*Mat.* 23.) for building and garnishing the Sepulchres of the Prophets, and yet persecuting Him and those that followed Him: notwithstanding his Office and doctrine agreed with that of the Old Prophet. Let me therefore ask you, have ye not the book of *Martyrs* in your houses, and set some price on it? Doe ye not there read of the ancient *Bishops* of the Primitive Church suffering Martyrdom for the truth of Christ? And doe not ye applaud them, abhorring the Cruelty of their Persecutors, and saying, *If we had been in their dayes we would not have been partakers in that blood*? Doe ye not also there read of *Cranmer*, *Ridly*, *Latimer*, with other Bishops, and many of the Clergy of this Land,

Self-Condemnation of the Pharisees.

How it concerns these days.

Land, ſuffering the flames for that truth, which they by a juſt Reformation had reeſtabliſhed in this Church? Doe you not applaud and praiſe them, when you read their Acts and ſufferings, abhorring the cruelty of their Perſecutors, and ſaying, *If we had been in their dayes, we would not &c.* Thus you *build their ſepulchres, garniſh* and adorne their Monuments or Memories, and now examine whether you have not done the like to thoſe, that followed them, in the ſame *Office*, which they bore in the ſame *Doctrine*, which they taught in the ſame reformed *Worſhip*, which they reſtored, held, and Sealed with their blood; ſee if ye have not done more then they which ſlew thoſe Martyrs: for ye have not only ſpoiled their *Perſons* of all their means and livelihood, but alſo taken away the maintenance from the *Office*, and (as much as in you) the Office from the *Church*: a double Sacriledge which the *Romaniſts* that killed thoſe Martyrs would abhor to be guilty of.

I ſpeake this not to the reproach of

of any, but to the conviction of all whom it may concern, that they may fear the *Woe* our Sav our there denounces in the like caſe, *That all ſhould be required of that Generation.* It is juſt with God, when After-generations will not take warning by the former, but doe the like, to bring upon them the greater puniſhment, and make them bear, what the former had deſerved. And examine I beſeech you, how far ye have conſented to, or approved of the ſhedding their blood, the ſpoiling their perſons, the ſequeſtring their eſtates who have ſuffered in theſe dayes, and yet held and taught the ſame Religion and Doctrine with thoſe former Martyrs: how farre ye have had an hand in, or conſented to that horrid Sacriledge and devaſtation of Church-meanes committed in theſe dayes: conclude your ſelves ſo far chargeable with the guilt of that former Cruelty and wrong done to the Martyred Biſhops and Clergy in Queen *Maryes* dayes, and of that firſt Sacriledge committed in her Fathers dayes: and that ye muſt

anſwer

anſwer for it (by our Saviours reckoning, *Mat.* 23. 35.) ſo much the deeper, becauſe ye have not taken warning by the former, but done the like; and added to the guilt of Blood, and Sacriledge, which lay before upon this Land, not onely by your perſecuting of Them, againſt whom ye had no other accuſation, than what the Papiſts had againſt thoſe Martyrs, their faithfull and conſtant holding to the eſtabliſhed reformation of the Church of *England*; but alſo by your ſeizing of Church-meanes, and aboliſhing the *Office* of the chief Governours of the Church; a double Sacriledge (as I ſaid) which neither *Romaniſts* nor Antient *Schiſmaticks* would dare to commit.

Gods Iudgements on Schiſm and Sacriledge.

It is worthy our noting, how it pleaſed God to ſhew his judgement upon Schiſm and Sacriledge in the beginnings of his Church, both *Jewiſh* and *Chriſtian*, to the end that his people might ever after feare to doe the like. We ſee *Numb.* 16: who they were that roſe up againſt *Moſes* and *Aaron*, ſaying, *Ye take*

too

too much upon you, ye Sons of Levi, seeing all the Congregation are holy every one of them, the very saying of these Times; and it is plain what they committed in so saying and doing, *Schism* in departing from their lawfull Governours, and sacriledge in breaking in upon, or invading the priests Office; and the judgement shewn upon them is notorious; a *Fire broke out* upon many of them, and a *Schism* or rent made in the Earth swallowed up the rest. So in the beginning of the Christian Church we find *Act.* 5. what a fearfull judgement was shewn upon *Ananias* and his Wife for withdrawing part of that, he had devoted to the use of the Church; That they may fear who are so hardy, as to commit greater *Sacriledge* in taking to their private use, what others have applied to the service of the Church.

And shall I speak the Result of my Thoughts, secretly enquiring, what might be the Cause, wherefore it should please God to suffer the Church of *Rome* to continue in so powerfull condition, notwithstanding all

VVhy God suffers Error so much to prevaile against Truth.

all the Errors, and profanations taught and practiſed therein? I ſaw reaſon, wherefore God (whoſe *way is in the Sanctuary. Pſ.*77.13. ſecret, but holy and juſt) ſhould for the ſins and careleſneſſe of Chriſtians, turning his grace into wantonneſs, ſuffer (after 600 yeares knowledge of his Truth) many Errors to enter, and prevail generally over the Church, and make the *word* of truth *more precious*; to the end that they which *were approved might be manifeſt*, 1 *Cor.*11. And wherefore he ſhould for the diviſions and cares of Chriſtians, ſuffer the Vanity of *Mahumetan* ſuperſtition to gain ground upon the Chriſtian Territories, to the puniſhment of many, and the trial of thoſe that were conſtant; But that after it pleaſed him to make the light of the Goſpel break out, and the truth appear in the Reformation, he ſhould ſuffer the Church of *Rome* with all her detected Errors (which from the *Sixt age* of Chriſtianity had prevailed) ſtill to continue in power and glory as to the greater part of what it poſſeſſed: beſides that generall

reaſon,

reaſon, (the lives of Proteſtants too much unanſwerable to the Truth and light God had opened unto them) I can finde no ſpeciall one, unleſſe it be the *guilt of ſacriledge* in moſt proteſtant Churches tumultuarily reformed; caſting out Biſhops, invading their Office, and ſeizing upon the revenues of their Churches. Thus to the diſhonour and prejudice of Gods Truth, making it a part of their Reformation to caſt out that, which the Catholick Church had alwayes carefully obſerved: and was yet commendably reteined in the Church of *Rome*. Had the Reformation every where (as it did in *England*) reteined the Ancient prayers and form of Liturgy, the ancient Government by Biſhops, and not laid hands on the meanes of the Church: the *Dagon* of *Romiſh* Error would every where have faln before it.

If the prevailing of Sects to the diſturbance of this Church be objected againſt the Regular reformation of it: We acknowledge God is juſt, and has now *covered* the face of this Church *with a Clond in his his*

Anger, and for our sins chiefly, who should *have kept the charge of his Sanctuary*, and his holy things: We are ready to receive the charge of any Personall failings or neglects, in the use of our *power*, *Office*, performance of our *Duties* according to our severall stations: yet let them know they had not sufficient Authority to make Reformation of Personal Abuses; but if through our sides they strike, as they doe at the *Power*, *Office* and *Function* it self, and because they conceive us unworthy of the meanes applyed to the Church, will therefore take it to themselves, let them fear what will follow; and what can follow but confusion, both from the boundlesse course of Error finding no stay, when once it has past the due limits, and from the usuall Course of Gods justice punishing deceitfull men with their own pretences, feares, and delusions?

For when once the spirit of Error has forsaken the Rule, and broken the bounds of lawfull Government which held all together, has raised so many humors, and impowred so many

ny ſects, what one way (right or wrong) can be agreed on, ſetled, eſtabliſhed? It is not imaginable without changing of the Errors and deſtructive Principles, upon which the diſcord is raiſed, and continued. And what can be the end or Iſſue ſuitable to ſuch proceedings and to the juſt judgement of God, but that after there has been *Levelling upon Levelling*, and every ſect has had its courſe to the puniſhment of this ſinfull unthankfull Nation, we ſhould be expoſed to the danger of ſome forrein power, that will impoſe new Lawes and another Religion upon this people, if a more generall humiliation doe not prevent it? I doe not mean a *Faſting for ſtrife* as they did, *Iſa.* 58.4. (we have had too much of that already, to the greater provocation of Almighty God) but a real true repentance, in *turning every man from his evil way*, and *from the violence that is in their hands*, as the *Ninivites*, did *Jon.* 3.8. Confuſion of boundleſs Error.

It was the Pretence or fear of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* gathered together in their great Councel againſt

Puniſhed often with its owne pretences.

Chriſt. *Venient Romani*— if they ſhould ſuffer him and his doctrine, the *Romans would come and take away their place and nation*, Jo. 11. 48. and therefore God in his juſt judgement did puniſh them (as he threatned, *Iſa.* 66. 4.) in *chuſing their deluſions, and bringing their feares upon them*; the *Romans* did come, and therefore come and tooke away their Place and Nation, becauſe they tooke away Chriſt and oppoſed his Goſpell: and to make the eaſier way for the *Romans* to come in, ſeverall factions (as *Ioſephus* tells us) prevailing amongſt them, ceaſed not in the mean time to deſtroy one the other. So it was the *pretence*, and this *fear* was put into the people, that if the Church of *England* and the Governours thereof were ſuffered to goe on, *Venient Romani*, the *Romiſh* Religion, or Popery would come in: and by this *fear* or *jealouſy* the People were raiſed againſt their ſuperiours, as the people were then againſt Chriſt. When as indeed by their pulling down, what formerly was well eſtabliſhed, and by deſtroying

ing one what the other builds, they make fair way for the *Romiſh* Religion, or the *Alcoran*, or *Atheiſm* to come in over their Ruines, or through the many breaches made by ſeverall Sects: If the Teares and prayers of the obedient Sons of this Church, and of thoſe that would live peaceably in the Land, doe not prevent it, by averting Gods juſt wrath and procuring a reſtauration to this Church, that it *may be a praiſe again upon Earth.*

There is hope and comfort in the next *verſe*, Iſa. 66.5. to them *that tremble at the word of the Lord. Your brethren that hated yow, that caſt yow out for my Names ſake, ſaid. Let the Lord be glorified:* (bleſſing him for the ſucceſſe of their iniqnity, or in confidence thereof provoking him to ſhew his approbation of their Cauſe and doings, by his judgements) *but he ſhall appear (to your joy, and they ſhall be aſhamed.* The firſt *Ejectors* or Levellers of our Time (thoſe of the Presbyterian way) who *caſt out* and ſequeſtred whom they pleaſed, and tooke poſſeſſion, and ſaid *Let the*

Lord be glorified for their ſucceſſe: great cauſe have they, (now it appears what confuſion follows upon their beginnings) to *be aſhamed* of what they have done. I pray God they may, and lay it ſadly to heart, and that all others, who have advanced upon their or the like Principles, may in time conſider it; and not think it enough to ſay, *the Lord be glorified*, becauſe they proſper and are become rich, but rather enquire, whether that they have done, be as to their private advantage and gain, ſo to the behooſe of Gods Church and the advancement of true Religion, and whether the Lord, to whom they have ſo oft appealed (by their *Faſts* and *Thanksgivings*) can indeed own their doings, as making for *his glory*: certainly the Lord muſt deny himſelf, which he will not do, if he own *Injuſtice*, *Schiſme*, *and Sacriledge*; Hee forbeares a while, and *keepes ſilence* (for Cauſes beſt known to himſelf) and men proſpering by thoſe ſins, think *he is ſuch a one as themſelves*, (approving their doings:) *but he will reprove them*,

and

and ſet before them what they have done; *He will appeare*, and *they ſhall be aſhamed.*

If ſuch conſiderations as theſe, prevaile not with them, that doe gain by the formentioned ſins, yet let the word of exhortation take hold upon you, all you that have followed the Schiſm *in the ſimplicity of your hearts*: not engaged by any deſign of gain or ſelf-intereſt, but only deceived with the pretence of *Purity* in Gods worſhip, and of *ſtrictneſſe* of life. Doe not make your ſelves guilty of other mens ſins; ſins that cannot ſtand with *Righteouſneſſe*, or that *Charity* which the Apoſtle requires ſo ſtrictly, 1 *Cor.* 13. without which all your other ſuppoſed *Purity*, *Faith* or *Knowledge*, is nothing, will ſtand you in no ſtead. Conſider ſadly, how thoſe you follow, have led you from the Unity of this your Nationall Church, and thereby from the profeſſion of Catholick Primitive Truth: from Obedience to your lawfull Governors and Guides, who bore the ſame Office, taught the ſame Doctrine, held the ſame way of

Exhort. to all that truly deſire Purity.

of publick Worship, as did those martyrd Bishops in Primitive Times, as did also those other in Queene *Marie's* dayes: How, I say, they have led you from this Catholique Communion, into a way of which (whether Classicall or Congregationall) we see the late and irregular beginning: it being but the product of some *tumultuary Reformations* made in *France*, *Geneva*, *Holland*, or *Scotland*, and by those that would be contentious here, imitated and violently attempted, to the disturbance of this Church, not without the down-right guilt of Schism and Sacriledge.

which cannot be had truly in the state of Schisme.

Consider it sadly, and do as those *Confessors* did, who (being led away by the *Novation* Schismaticks under like pretence of *purity* and *strictness*) as soon as they perceived their error, confessed it, and returned to the Unity of the Catholick Church; as St. *Cyprian* often relates and propounds it as an example and motive for Unity. Do you so, and then may you obteine what you pretend was your aim and desire, *Purity* and righteous-

righteouſneſſe indeed, which you cannot in the way of Schiſme by reaſon it holds not a perfect Rule of Righteouſneſs, but ſuch as is ſtrict in denying ſmall things, and flying appearances of Evill, but large in admitting great Offences, teaching to *ſtraine at Gnats*, and *ſwallow Camells*, to ſcruple at a Rite and Ceremony, but makes no bones of Diſobedience, Schiſme, Sacriledge, and ſo neceſſarily leaves your Conſciences (while ye are in that Communion) defiled with your partaking in ſuch ſinnes. But return into the Unity of this Church, and ſhew your Communion with it in the publique worſhip of God, Liturgy, and Sacrament: then may *you perfect Holinſſe in the feare of God*, and with good Conſcience peforme all the parts of Purity and Righteouſneſſe: And do it, in Gods name, according to all the Duties he requires of you, and according to all the opportnuities he puts into your hands: So will your *Purity and Righteouſneſſe exceed that*

of

of the Pharisees; and as many as walk after this Rule, Peace be on them and Mercy, and on the Israel of God. Amen.

The End.